Volume XXIX] *January, 1924* [*Number 2*

The

American Historical Review

LAW IN HISTORY [1]

ON the morning of the tenth of August, 1588, the last and most eventful day of the running fight of the English fleet with the Spanish Armada, the wind blew steadily from the southwest. As the day wore on it rose to the force of a gale; the Spanish ships as they emerged from the harbor of Calais, unmanageable and harried by the English, drove northward before the wind, past the mouth of the Scheldt, for which they were bound, and through the North Sea, till after a long and stormy course around Scotland and Ireland, broken and scattered, they regained the Spanish and Portuguese harbors. If the wind on that critical day had blown from some other quarter, the Invincible Armada might have justified its name and effected the invasion of England. What an overwhelming influence on the course of events to be exercised by a mere vagary of the weather!

In the year 1527, Henry VIII. was approaching the "dangerous age" of forty. He was ill-at-ease. His somewhat irregular marriage seemed unblessed. He had no living children except one little girl and she was in frail health. Early in that year a young lady came to court, black-eyed, vivacious, charming. With striking contemporaneity the king began to express doubts of the validity of his marriage with Catherine and to give evidence of having fallen in love with the new maid of honor. The story is a familiar one, in which the personal and the public elements are indistinguishable. The unsuccessful negotiations with the pope, the divorce, the marriage with Anne, the statutory separation of the Church of England from Rome, the dissolution of the monasteries, the regulation of the Church by the State, changes in practice and doctrine, followed rapidly upon one another till the whole course of the official English Reformation was run. What an enormous influence on the course of history to be exercised by the wayward passion of one human being!

[1] Presidential address delivered before the American Historical Association at Columbus, December 27, 1923.

In the middle of the fifth century a wild band of Orientals, the Huns, under the leadership of Attila, the Scourge of God, swept through Gaul and Italy, burning, slaying, and plundering. They depleted populations, overthrew governments, desolated provinces, reduced to utter confusion the wasted Empire. What an impression on history made by the destructive sweep of a barbarous horde through a civilized country!

Just a thousand years later, in 1345 and the years following, a new disease swept across Europe, the bubonic plague, the "Black Death", as it has been called. It was more devastating than the armies of Attila. High and low, old and young, clergy and laity, fell before its onset, till in many regions it is estimated that within a year one-half the population died instead of a twentieth as in ordinary years. Great economic and social changes took place during these years. Serfdom passed rapidly away, monks and nuns in the monasteries and even the secular clergy deteriorated, one form of Gothic architecture was abandoned and gave place to another. Such wide and varied effects on the course of history have been attributed by historians to this the most fatal of recorded epidemics.

As the war of the American Revolution progressed, disunion, disloyalty, incapacity appeared; jealousy between colonies and between officers weakened the army; languor among the people, inaction by Congress, discouragement of the leaders, all made the days dark and the outcome doubtful. But there was one great unfailing element of strength, the personality of Washington. He stood firm, he counselled wisely, he led skillfully. The ultimate success of the Revolution seems inseparably bound up with the character and the abilities of this one man.

It is by this time quite sufficiently evident that I have been giving some almost chance examples of what are apparently great historical effects flowing from causes of a relatively simple, individual, casual character: a turn of the weather, an onset of ill-regulated royal passion, a fortuitous invasion by a fierce army or a destructive epidemic, the appearance of a great man. A thousand such instances might readily be adduced. They have often been stated with high authority. An article in the *American Historical Review* some years ago was entitled "Wednesday, August 19th, 1812, 6.30 p.m., the Birth of a World Power"; that date marking the defeat of the *Guerrière* by the *Constitution*. On this day and at this hour, according to Mr. Charles Francis Adams, and as the result of a naval battle, the United States emerged into international recognition. Another former president of this Association, the master of us all in the field of English

constitutional history, has remarked that Edward I. would probably have taken measures to prevent the growth of a strong parliament, if he had foreseen the danger to the monarchy involved in such an institution. That is to say, a certain king in the thirteenth century would have defined the future direction of development of the English Parliament. My allotted time this evening could easily be filled with a mere enumeration of instances where great and general effects are asserted to have followed upon certain accidental or personal causes.

But are these statements of cause and effect true, or are the appearances deceptive? Have these events and personalities really had the influence on the course of history so easily and naturally attributed to them? A hasty re-examination of the instances I have taken may suggest the need of a more adequate explanation. Although the wind blew from the southwest on the tenth of August, 1588, it did not blow adversely for the Spaniards through the whole twenty years of the Elizabethan war. Yet Spain never successfully invaded England. Moreover, as we compare the two countries it becomes doubtful whether, even if Spanish troops had landed on the shores of England, any serious influence would have been exerted on the general course of the history of the two countries. Spain, overstrained by too ambitious undertakings, unsupported by adequate economic resources, deficient in statesmanship, was an anaemic giant, holding her predominance in Europe with a constantly slackening hand. England, of youthful vigor, hardening Protestantism, rapidly increasing wealth, an exhilarating sense of her own nationality, was of almost unlimited, if undisciplined, powers and was especially resistant to all forms of foreign control. Whether a Spanish or an English wind blew on a certain day really made little difference. England was bound to remain independent of Spain.

Can anyone believe there would have been no Reformation in England in the sixteenth century if Henry VIII. had not fallen in love with Anne Boleyn? As we follow the stream of English history downward toward 1527, evidences of an approaching religious struggle are visible on every hand. There was much native heresy. The influence of Luther was active at Cambridge, in London, and through the eastern counties while Henry VIII. was still living happily with Catherine and writing essays in support of the pope. The monarchy was becoming constantly stronger and threatening to come into conflict with the claims of the old Church to semi-independence. Many of the monasteries were bankrupt and could have continued to exist but a little longer at best. Change was in the air; economic change, political change, intellectual change. Is it likely the Church

alone would remain unchanged? A breach with the medieval Church took place in all the northern countries of Europe. Would England have been an exception? I think it is safe to say that the Reformation would have occurred in England at about the time it did and about in the form it did, if Henry VIII. had never seen Anne Boleyn, indeed, if Henry VIII. had never lived.

Much the same observations are true of the American Revolution. During our whole colonial period the forces that worked for divergence from the mother country were active. The habits of a people growing up in a new country, three thousand miles in distance and several months in time from the ruling state, the diversity of religious opinion that had driven so many of them from home and that continued to increase, the conflicting economic interests of England and her American colonies, were all permanent influences that tended to separation. Independence sooner or later was natural because of the difference of our institutions, possible because of our size and numbers, inevitable because of the stolid and narrow-minded type of government of England. American independence as we look on it now was not the creation of Washington and the "Fathers", but a necessary result of the divergence of the two countries.

So it is with the other instances. How little occasion the modern historian engaged in tracing the fall of the Roman Empire and the transformation of Roman institutions in the fifth century finds for even a mention of Attila! Every successive student of social and economic change in the fourteenth century gives less consideration to the "Black Death" and more to that gradual, obscure, and almost imponderable disintegration of the early medieval type of society which gave its character to that period. As to August 19, 1812, the United States would soon have emerged into world significance, if the battle between the *Guerrière* and the *Constitution* had gone the other way, just as the Western world would have been discovered by Cabral in 1500, if it had not been discovered by Columbus in 1492. Similarly as one traces the contemporaneous development of the House of Commons in England, the Estates-General in France, the Cortes in Spain, and the Reichstag in Germany in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, each subject to the influences of its own environment, one has grave doubts whether Edward I. could have seriously influenced English parliamentary growth even if to his other abilities as a statesman should have been added prophetic insight into the future.

These great changes seem to have come about with a certain inevitableness; there seems to have been an independent trend of events,

some inexorable necessity controlling the progress of human affairs. If a thousand instances were taken instead of five or six, all would show the same result. Examined closely, weighed and measured carefully, set in true perspective, the personal, the casual, the individual influence in history sinks in significance, and great cyclical forces loom up. Events come of themselves, so to speak; that is, they come so consistently and unavoidably as to rule out as causes not only physical phenomena but voluntary human effort.

So arises the conception of *law in history*. History, the great course of human affairs, has been the result not of voluntary action on the part of individuals or groups of individuals, much less of chance; but has been subject to law.

This is an old conception. It was formulated in one of the earliest written productions that time has left us. In the papyrus of the "Precepts of Ptah Hotep", it is said: "Never hath that which men have prepared for come to pass; for what the deity hath commanded, even that thing cometh to pass." Providence, fate, destiny, law, has controlled the affairs of man, as it has of men, as it controls all things. Few indeed are the paths we follow through this our universe without soon seeing stretching out before us, however dimly, the broad highway of law. So Lucifer, according to the poet, discovered.

> On a starred night Prince Lucifer uprose.
> Tired of his dark dominions swung the fiend
> Above the rolling ball in cloud part screened,
> Where sinners hugged their spectre of repose.
> Poor prey to his hot fit of pride were those.
> And now upon his western wing he leaned,
> Now his huge bulk o'er Afric's sands careened,
> Now the black planet shadowed Arctic snows.
> Soaring through wider zones that pricked his scars
> With memory of the old revolt from Awe,
> He reached a middle height, and at the stars,
> Which are the brain of heaven, he looked, and sank.
> Around the ancient track marched, rank on rank,
> The army of unalterable law.

Human history, like the stars, has been controlled by immutable, self-existent law, by what Mr. Gladstone in his sonorous eloquence once described in Parliament as "those great social forces which move on in their might and majesty, and which the tumult of our debates does not for a moment impede or disturb". Men have on the whole played the parts assigned to them; they have not written the play. Storms and pestilences and battles and revolutions have been of great significance to participants in them and have seemed so

to those who have chronicled their details, but they have really been only ripples and eddies in the great stream. Powerful rulers and gifted leaders have seemed to choose their policies and to carry them out, but their choice and the success with which they have been able to impose their will on their times have alike depended on conditions over which they have had little control.

Why should a labored argument be required to prove that human affairs are subject to law? Man has a body, which is subject to physical and chemical and biological law. Heat and gravitation and metabolism act upon him exactly as they act on other organic substances, and these forces act according to already formulated or about-to-be-formulated law. The processes of the minds of men, individually and in groups, are fast being explained by psychological and social laws. Man is simply a part of a law-controlled world.

Do not say that daily experience is against the rule of law in history. The laws that govern the course of history may be no more apparent than the laws that govern the winds and the storms. "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof but canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth." Yet no one doubts that the blowing of the wind is subject to the laws of physics. The variety and the wilfulness and the unaccountableness are in the complexity of the phenomena, not in the underlying fixity of the law.

If all this is true; if history, like everything else in the rational universe, has been subject to law, or laws, can these be found? What are these laws like? Are they like objective statutes, or like the subjective laws of mathematics and logic, or like physical laws, or biological laws, or economic or moral laws? There is but one way to find out—to do as others in their various fields have done before, to consider the phenomena, to make a more or less happy guess at some large principle, then test it by a wider comparison with the facts; if so be that a generalization can be found which we can fairly call a law of history. When we have found it we shall know what it is like.

To call the six statements I am about to make a tentative formulation of historical law would be an extreme exaggeration of my claims and even of my hopes. No assertion of humility is too strong, no conviction of uncertainty too assured, no realization of incompetence too profound to describe the state of mind of a serious student of history who sets about the task of reducing its vast multifariousness to simplicity, or who undertakes to find the law or laws which underlie its apparent lawlessness. Yet laws of history there must be, and my guesses at some of them are these.

Looking over the field of history there is evidently a law of continuity. "There is no new thing under the sun." All events, conditions, institutions, personalities, come from immediately preceding events, conditions, institutions, personalities. This is a familiar observation and will probably be readily accepted. It is the continuity of history that makes possible the popular and fascinating search for origins. Starting with almost any historic phenomenon we may trace it or its progenitors back and back into a time in which only Mr. Wells and Professor Robinson feel at home; and doubtless, with some assistance from the historic imagination, trace it and its descendants forward and forward into a time in which only Mr. Wells feels at home, all without any breach of continuity.

Yet this conception of the continuity of history, this historic law, so familiar to the modern historian, is comparatively new in historical writing and still unfamiliar to people in general. In popular belief Alfred founded Oxford, Luther began the Reformation, Gutenberg invented printing, Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, the Kaiser started the Great War; yet none of these statements satisfies the thoughtful historian. Actual origins elude us; everything is the outcome of something preceding; the immediate, sudden appearance of something, its creation by an individual or a group at some one moment of time, is unknown in history.

We say sometimes that a certain event came like a thunderbolt from a clear sky. But that is a mere form of speech. Thunderbolts do not come from a clear sky; they come from unobserved clouds. So the suddenness of an historical event is only the measure of our carelessness of observation. Lowell in his *Ode to France* points out that it was so of the Revolution.

> As flake by flake the beetling avalanches
> Build up their imminent crags of noiseless snow
> Till some chance thrill the loosened ruin launches,
> And the blind havoc leaps unwarned below,
> So grew and gathered through the silent years
> The madness of a people, wrong by wrong.
> There seemed no strength in the dumb toiler's tears,
> No strength in suffering; but the Past was strong.
> The brute despair of trampled centuries
> Leaped up with one hoarse yell and snapped its bands,
> Groped for its right with horny calloused hands,
> And stared around for God with bloodshot eyes.

The continuity of history is not merely a fact; it is a law. By no voluntary action can any great breach of historical continuity be accomplished. The English parliamentary leaders of 1649 might

abolish the kingship and the House of Lords and found a republic; but they could not prevent the government of England drifting back through the Protectorate and the Restoration to a monarchy but little changed from its old form and powers. The French revolutionists might attempt to make all things new; but little by little they were forced to submit to the law of continuity and restore the Church, the monarchy, the nobility, and much of the social system as they had existed before 1789. And now poor Russia, perhaps poor Germany, is finding how incapable a nation is of making any great break in historical development. Institutions have been modified, not destroyed; races have been subjugated or absorbed, not exterminated; beliefs have altered, not ceased; human history has been an unbroken narrative.

Secondly, looking over the field of history, there seems to be a law of impermanence, of mutability. The fall of empires is one of the most familiar of historic phenomena. It would be too trite to enumerate Assyria and Babylon and Egypt and Persia, Greece and Rome, Spain and Germany, the Lydians, the Medes, the Tartars, the Moguls, the Turks. We should have to add to them the unknown peoples and cultures that have left behind them only the mysterious ruins of Yucatan and Mashonaland and Mongolia—nations happy, presumably, since they certainly have no annals, the men who erected the gigantic figures on Easter Island, the builders of Stonehenge and Carnac and the Druid circles and the long lines of standing stones on the bare hills that fringe the western coast of Europe. Even then we should have named only the most conspicuous instances. So persistent and infinitely repeated has been this disappearance of successive organizations of men and types of civilization that it gives every indication of being the result of a law rather than of a mere succession of chances.

The clue to such a law may possibly be found in a biological analogy. Biologists have long observed that organic species highly specialized and suited to one environment or mode of existence tend to become extinct. They have not been adaptable, and have therefore died out, while the ever active causes of evolution have produced new species from older and simpler stocks to take their places. Palaeontology, the study of life in the geologic past, is largely occupied with species specially adapted to one set of circumstances and therefore unable to survive in another.

We are not concerned here with the origin or the survival of man as an animal species. His physical and mental conformation seem to have become established in an early interglacial or even preglacial

period and not to have changed materially since. His mental powers have enabled him in a considerable degree to control his environment; he seems to have powers of adaptation and therefore of physical survival unrivalled by any other species. But socially, politically, in organized bodies, his fate has been a much more unstable one. It is with man in this capacity that we are occupied in this search for law; with his life in groups during the few thousand years of recorded history whose phenomena we are trying to reduce to some kind of order. Groups of men have, like animal and vegetable species, tended to run out. Apparently peoples, races, nations, have "struck their pace"; they have become differentiated from other peoples, characterized by their own physical, mental, and cultural differences, which, though of a minor character compared with the differences of species, have given them a dangerous fixity of type. They have ceased to be adaptable; politically and socially they are no longer capable of change or of conformity to a changing world. Populations insufficiently responsive to the requirements of subsistence, to the pressure of competing nations, to new inventions or new ideas, have stolidly awaited conquest or absorption or transformation. The law of mutability, of decay of nations, is a measure of man's incapacity to change his habits. Unless nations can change as the times change, they must die.

Conservatism, therefore, with a curious inversion of its intention, brings about the destruction of the group of fixed institutions it wishes to preserve. One hundred per cent. Americanism is more dangerous to the perpetuity of American institutions than a less percentage would be. Established formulas, traditional conceptions, fixed legal principles, dominating ideals, are the marks of a highly specialized, unadaptable, unchanging community, and, however elevated or admirable, are forces tending, under this historic law, to its ultimate destruction. Fundamentalism is self-destructive. "The letter killeth, the spirit maketh alive." It has only been the amendment and the stretching of the Constitution of the United States that have enabled us to survive politically under it. It has only been the abandonment of the old imperial ideas that has kept the British Empire in existence. Elasticity, adaptiveness, capacity to conform to change, are the requisites for survival of a race, of a nation, of a type of civilization. The absence of these has brought about their fall. Perhaps an America scornful of a League of Nations, wedded to isolation, struggling to keep her life separate, unconformable to a world that has been made essentially one by economic and intellectual changes, may not be able to survive. Thus the law of mutability, of instability of nations, will receive one more illustration.

Thirdly, looking over the field of history there seems to be a law of interdependence—interdependence of individuals, of classes, of tribes, of nations. The human race seems to be essentially an organism, a unit. As Paul said, we are "every one members, one of another". No part of the human race in history has really progressed by the injury of another. We have all risen or fallen together. Conquests of one people by another have always demoralized the conquerors. Success in war has generally introduced lower standards, less individual freedom, less tolerance, less elevation of spirit. The Persians after their conquests in Asia, Athens when she dominated the Delian League, Rome when she was mistress of the world, the Roman Catholic Church when its alliance with the temporal power had given it supremacy, Britain when she ruled over a group of forcibly annexed dependencies, the Allies after the downfall of Napoleon, Germany after 1871, were, according to the judgment of many of their own contemporary and national historians, defeated morally; and who shall say that France and Italy, England and the United States, are freer and better countries since the Great War than before? The fruits of victory in war have often proved to be apples of Sodom, turning to dust in the mouth.

So it has been with divided races and classes. Dependent races have been the curse of the ruling race. The Helots of Sparta, the Allies of Rome, Ireland under England, have been constant sources of weakness to their masters. Slaveholding classes have been forced into cruelty, shaken by vague fears of servile revolt, weakened by exemption from wholesome labor. Slaves and dependents, on the other hand, have been cowardly, deceitful, unenterprising, incapable of progress. The division into two classes has been demoralizing to both. The abolition of slavery and the freeing of dependents has been a condition precedent to any considerable economic or political or moral advancement for either class.

Landholding and employing classes without sense of responsibility to their tenants or employees have often been so blinded by class interest as to be a danger to the well-being of the whole community; and the same is true of irresponsible tenant and employed classes. No class can safely rule over or be ruled by another class.

Nations also are interdependent. Years ago at a meeting of the Historical Association similar to this a prominent and high-minded American diplomat remarked that he had attended the Algeciras Conference with the single preoccupation of using his influence for the sole benefit of the United States. I believed then and believe now that in so doing and at the same time expecting that the best results

would follow for the United States he was neglecting this law. Nationalism, highly developed and without sense of responsibility for the well-being of other nations, is perhaps the most complete antithesis to human interdependence. It was the ultimate cause of the late war and is the threatening occasion for one to come. The world is even now watching to see whether one nation can by violence reimburse itself for its losses from another without, like Samson, bringing the temple of its own prosperity and that of all Europe down in ruins in the process. Can Germany be depressed while France and her allies are exalted, or will the law of interdependence act and all be depressed together? For I am not contending that human interdependence is an aspiration, a hope of the idealist; but that it is a law, to which the realist is just as subject as the idealist, inexorable in its workings, beyond our control, immanent in the conditions to which mankind has been and is subject.

Fourthly, there seems to be a law of democracy, a tendency for all government to come under the control of all the people. There has been a belief popular at certain times, especially among monarchs, that monarchy is the form of government preferred by an all-controlling Providence. But monarchies have been no more stable, as they have been no more wise, than other forms of government. There has been on the contrary a clear and, in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, a rapidly growing tendency to the overthrow or limitation of government carried on by a single individual. Autocratic monarchy has practically disappeared.

Again, there has been at certain times, there exists still, especially among men of aristocratic temperament, a belief that aristocracy in one or other of its forms is the normal type of government; that government should rest in the hands of a specially endowed, specially trained, or specially chosen group of people. There has appeared within the last few years, especially in the United States, a considerable body of writing opposing the increase of control by the mass of the people over their representatives, administrative, legislative, and judicial. Organizations have been formed and an active propaganda carried on with the object of preventing the advance of democracy. I believe these men are setting themselves in opposition to a law of history.

Every invention that makes easier the diffusion of information, every increase in the mobility and alertness of mind of the mass of the people, every rise in the standard of life, draws a larger part of the people into contact with the problems of government. Education brings a sense of power over government; moral training brings a

sense of responsibility for the uses to which government may be put. Printing, steam and electrical transmission, radiation, popular education, increased wages, the progress of thought, leisure, all tend to extend democracy. These are practically irresistible forms of advance and the resultant advance of democracy therefore cannot be prevented. Our own generation has seen the introduction in all progressive countries of an additional half of the population into the political sphere, and the dikes set up against the spread of popular government have been overflowed in all directions. Moreover democracy has on the whole justified its existence and made probable its permanence by more wise legislation and administration than any other form of government has given. This is perhaps a hard saying, but a careful historical comparison of the works of autocracy, aristocracy, so-called representative government, and democracy will show, I believe, greater vigor, greater ability, greater justice, and greater enlightenment in the service of the last than of either of the others.

Again, democracy is being extended to other interests of mankind than those traditionally considered as political. The absolute control of economic life by the possessors of capital has long been recognized to be disadvantageous to society and has been limited in various ways. Of recent decades, in various countries, under the leadership for the most part of enlightened employers, something approaching industrial democracy has been introduced in its place. The control of trade interests has been placed in the hands of all those connected with the trade, instead of being left in the hands of one class. In other cases the modern democratic state has drawn industry more or less within its own sphere. It would seem that the law of democracy is subjecting this group of men's interests also to its sway.

If the arguments for the existence of this historical law seem to be drawn from the phenomena of a more recent period than for the other laws it may perhaps be attributed to its overwhelming interest in the immediate past and in the present. A world war to which the genius of one American President gave dignity and unity by describing it as a war to make the world safe for democracy, just as a former President had at Gettysburg declared the war he was waging to be for the preservation of democracy in the United States, has nevertheless placed in power in almost every country a dictator or a majority whose belief in democracy is hesitant and incomplete. If a law of democracy exists, this condition can only be temporary; the law will soon again work with compelling force. If there is no such law, we are adrift on a sea whose winds and tides and shores are all un-

known. Who would not trust, if he may, the instincts and aspirations of the mass of the people in the passage perilous of the next few years, rather than the vagaries of a Mussolini, the obstinacy of a Poincaré, the pedantry of a Lenin, or the narrow vision and restricted interests of any one class of the people?

Fifthly, looking over the field of history I am convinced there is a law of necessity for free consent. Human beings are free agents in their relations to other human beings; they cannot permanently be compelled. Not only should all government be by the consent of the governed but all government has been by the consent of the governed. When men have not been willing to give their consent they have found numberless ways to avoid acceptance. They have protested, they have refused to acknowledge authority, they have refrained from action, they have resisted, they have rebelled; as a last resort they have allowed themselves to be put to death. It is consent, not force, that has on the whole held society together, that has supported governments, that has procured services. The consent has often been reluctant, it has never been actually forced. When forced it has not been consent, but mere yielding to violence, and violence has borne little fruit of achievement or permanence.

It has lately been said in excuse for his action by one of the European dictators that freedom has failed and force is the only remedy. Making a wider survey of history I should say rather that force has failed and freedom is the only remedy. Nothing has ever been really settled till the willing consent of all concerned has been obtained. Bismarck's " blood and iron ", as a means of settlement of the internal affairs of Germany, has already proved itself not a settlement. It could and did bring about a temporary cessation of conflict, but that was hardly a settlement which lasted less than half a century. A settlement, if this is a true historic law, requires a genuine acquiescence, however reluctant, in the arrangements being made. The peace of 1871 was evidently vitiated from the beginning by the German seizure against French protest of Alsace-Lorraine. When the German representative and one of the most enlightened representatives of the Allies affixed their signatures to the peace of 1919 under a similar protest, they were simply giving notice of what soon became evident, that consent to the Treaty of Versailles had not been obtained. The poor wreckage of peace that now encumbers Europe gives sad testimony to the working of the law in this case. The law of free consent has doubtless been disregarded more than it has been obeyed, but it is none the less a law, violation of which has been followed by failure to obtain the advantages that conformity to it would have

entailed. If a peace had been drawn up at Versailles to which the consent of Germany had been obtained, the world might now be relatively prosperous and free from dread of the future. The effects of force in history have been temporary and partial and illusory; voluntary acceptance alone has been permanent and adequate and substantial.

Sixthly, and lastly, so far as this groping search extends, there seems to be a law of moral progress. Obscurely and slowly, yet visibly and measurably, moral influences in human affairs have become stronger and more widely extended than material influences.

The desire for the wealth or the territory or the enslavable population of another region was considered sufficient excuse for attack by an early ruler and sufficient explanation for the attack by an ancient historian. If other than material causes are offered as explanations by Herodotus or Xenophon or Polybius or Livy they are of a low order, revenge or ambition, perhaps, instead of acquisitiveness. Mere plunder or a claim of feudal superiority was the basis of most medieval wars. In later times better reasons have been offered, have indeed existed. National independence or security, local liberties, religious or political sympathy, protection of the oppressed, the defense of an ideal—the professed motives for which modern governments and nations have gone to war—belong to a higher group of incentives than those of the wars of antiquity or the Middle Ages. Camouflage these may partly be. The First Vice-President of this Association may be correct in his statement that the recent great war arose primarily from economic causes; but the fact remains that many higher causes were involved. The people, always more moral than their rulers, would not at any time within the last four centuries have supported their governments in wars merely of plunder, aggression, or revenge.

If moral ideals have become increasingly predominant in the heat and unreason of war, it will be readily believed that they have asserted themselves with still more rapidly increasing force in the realm of peace. The disappearance of slavery, of serfdom, of the whipping of soldiers and sailors, criminals, apprentices, and school children, the diminution of personal oppression, of man's physical and legal power over women, of the greater advantages granted by the law to employers over employees and to landlords over tenants, the spread of sympathy, of mercy, of helpfulness, are just so many proofs of the existence of a law of moral progress.

A group of American industrial leaders is reported to have agreed among themselves lately, after calculating that the raw materials pro-

duced in the world are not sufficient for the needs of all the nations, to take all requisite steps, by diplomacy, by seizure, or by war, if necessary, to secure for the United States an adequate share of these materials. It is to be noted that this agreement, though involving public action, has been made, if made at all, secretly, without disclosure or acknowledgment in open discussion. It is evident that these projects, if such projects there are, are a violation of the law of moral progress. The world has gone beyond them. These ideals are no longer such as can be used in argument or widespread appeal. The men who hold them are behind the times; their objects can only be reached, if reached at all, by deceitful and nefarious means.

Not only intensively but extensively moral forces have tended to become predominant. There was a time when fidelity to contract, justice, mercy, applied only within the family. The validity of these principles gradually extended from the family to the tribe, to the nation, and now in these later ages from the nation to international relations. *Vae victis* was, in the mouth of Brennus the Gaul, sufficient defense for his peace with the Romans; to Mr. Wilson and Lloyd George, mistaken though they may have been, the Treaty of Versailles was a " peace of justice ". In moments of depression concerning present international relations it may be a solace to consider how recently humanity has risen to the realization of its international duties, and yet how sure is its progress toward that realization, for it is a progress governed by law.

Such are the six general laws I have ventured to state as discoverable by a search among historical phenomena: first, a law of continuity; second, a law of impermanence of nations; third, a law of unity of the race, of interdependence among all its members; fourth, a law of democracy; fifth, a law of freedom; sixth, a law of moral progress.

May I repeat that I do not conceive of these generalizations as principles which it would be well for us to accept, or as ideals which we may hope to attain; but as natural laws, which we must accept whether we want to or not, whose workings we cannot obviate, however much we may thwart them to our own failure and disadvantage; laws to be accepted and reckoned with as much as the laws of gravitation, or of chemical affinity, or of organic evolution, or of human psychology.

An urgent question concerning law in history must arise in every thoughtful mind. How much opportunity does the existence of historical law leave for the free choice and free action of man? This may perhaps be answered by asking how much opportunity does the

existence of physical law leave to the builder, the engineer, the navigator, the aviator? As much freedom as he is able to utilize, apparently. How much opportunity do the laws of chemistry leave to the metallurgist, the maker of dyes or explosives, the synthetic chemist? Enough apparently for him to work what seem miracles to us laymen. How much freedom in thinking do the laws of psychology leave to the scientist, the philosopher, the historian? Law in these fields does not bind thought or make man powerless, it only lays down the conditions under which he must think and act. The same is doubtless true of law in history.

If it be said that the laws I have used as analogies are laws of external nature, whereas history involves the element of the human will, it may be asked just how far any one of us is free and how far is he restricted in his individual actions? A man can live only in a certain period, neither in any earlier or later time. Ordinarily he can live only in one particular country and in the midst of one set of social and political conditions. He can possess only his own heredity. His physical and mental nature are drawn entirely from his ancestors. He has no capacities or proclivities that have not come to him through his inheritance. He is controlled at every turn by the natural laws of the world in which he dwells. And yet we feel free to act much as we choose. If our action is not entirely free it simulates freedom. We are so used to our limitations that it is only exceptionally we feel them. Individually we find a wide field of activity within the limits that condition and to a great degree control our action. We are free to act, subject to irresistible law in the background. We have only a margin of freedom, but that margin is wide enough for judgment, effort, self-sacrifice, heroism; for foolishness and wisdom, for weakness and strength.

Man historically has been in much the same position as men individually. He has been able to deflect slightly to one side or another the law-controlled course of events. He has been able to give special shape to general movements. If his action has been conformable to law it has been effective; when he has worked along with the great forces of history he has influenced constructively the course of events; when his action has violated historic law the results have been destructive, momentary, subject to reversal. Men have always been and are free to act; the results of their actions will depend on the conformity or nonconformity of these actions to historic law.

Finally, I wish to call attention to the great value the discovery of such law might have in the attainment of human happiness. If the laws that control human history can really be discovered and formu-

lated, the service to mankind will be far greater than that of the discovery of physical or psychological or even biological law. For one of the prime characteristics of law is that it is invariable. It acts in the present and will act in the future as it has in the past, and mankind sadly needs a guide for action in the present and for the future.

The knowledge of history has been of little practical value. "History teaches" is a formula that we often hear, but the thoughtful man gets little satisfaction from its use. He knows that history has been made to teach whatever is wished. Catholicism and Protestantism, militarism and pacifism, monarchy and republicanism, individualism and mass action, high tariffs and free trade, bimetallism and a gold standard, all appeal with equal confidence to the lessons of history. As a matter of fact, the treasure-house of history is so rich that all kinds of precedents can be drawn from it. It is a poor policy that cannot find some historical justification. An ingenious and industrious advocate can always find in history the arguments he wants. But so can his opponent; arguments from history are inconclusive except to those who are already convinced. There is absolutely no common agreement on what history teaches. This is probably because we have been able to reason from history only by analogy, and the analogy is never perfect; the historical example is never precisely like the present problem. History never repeats itself exactly. Some factors are the same, others are different. History teaching by example is a poor teacher.

It is true that the study of history is peculiarly enlightening. It teaches its votaries wisdom, if it does not teach specific lessons. Moderation, sanity, insight into the affairs of men in the present doubtless come to the historian as he studies the doings of men in the past. He may be, probably is, more likely to be right than other men in his judgments on current events. But wisdom is not transferable, and the historian has little leverage in persuading his fellow men. The rôle of Cassandra is at best an unprofitable one.

We sometimes claim that history interprets the present. That is true; it is the only clue to the present. But it is a cold comfort. The present is so momentary. While we are speaking, while we are thinking, the present slips back into the past, and the future bears down upon us. For practical uses, if history is to have a practical use, what we need is a clue to the future. This a knowledge of the laws of history might give us. If we knew the laws of history we might reason and act with the same intelligence and precision and anticipation of success with which the engineer acts in conformity

with the known laws of physics, or the astronomer with the laws of astronomy, or the cattle breeder with the Mendelian law of inheritance.

So great is this hope that I can look forward to some future meeting of this Association when the search for the laws of history and their application will have become the principal part of its procedure. Many of the sessions of such a meeting will be devoted, as now, to the difficult, interesting, and fruitful work of making clear the events of history and their proximate causes and effects; other sessions will doubtless be given to the perennial task of discussing how and why history should be taught in the schools; the President will no doubt recapitulate recent progress or commend or chide his colleagues or speculate on the larger implications of his subject. But the most conspicuous place on the programme will be assigned to some gifted young historical thinker who, quite properly disregarding the early and crude efforts of his predecessors, will propound and explain to the satisfaction of all his colleagues some new and far-reaching law or laws of history. Other sessions will be devoted to applying to some of the political and social and economic problems of the day well-known and by that time universally accepted historical laws. Then indeed will the leaves of the tree the historians have planted be for the healing of the nations.

EDWARD P. CHEYNEY.

AMERICAN OPINION OF THE FRENCH NINETEENTH-CENTURY REVOLUTIONS

In war-time the political groupings of the moment seem permanently valid. Yet no fact is more certain than the mutability of national friendships. These are not based on racial affinity, sentiment, or tradition alone, but on changing political and economic interests. The place occupied by England in the American emotional complex was radically different in 1759, 1776, and 1917. The country cherished one set of feelings toward France in 1778 and another twenty years later. This realization need not conduce to cynical reflections, but rather to a broader tolerance; it should lead away from dead hatreds and toward international-mindedness.

For France, it is true, American sympathy has been peculiarly tenacious. There has always been an emotional quality in our sentiment toward our earliest and latest ally. This feeling has been heightened whenever France has cast off a relatively despotic form of government in favor of a type more closely resembling our own. Yet even then, a closer scrutiny of American opinion in 1830, 1848, and 1870 reveals illuminating contrasts, which it is the purpose of this paper to analyze.

In 1830 public sentiment in the United States was peculiarly receptive to the news of foreign revolutions. With the election of Andrew Jackson in 1828, Western pioneer democracy had broken rudely into power, sweeping aside the traditional leadership of Massachusetts and Virginia. Inevitably the pace quickened; in this brisk, keen air of progress, men grew impatient with old ways and eager for change. When changes came abroad, they were greeted with ready sympathy. Not only so; our inexperience reflected itself generally in an exuberant delight when the news came, an optimism that did more credit to our hearts than to our heads. The comparative superficiality of American comment in this period must not be attributed solely to our lack of worldly wisdom; over-confidence was a note of early European liberalism as well, witness Macaulay's complete satisfaction with the England of the Reform Bill.

Mr. Rives, the American minister at Paris, sent home a eulogistic account of the July days, which he termed "one of the most wonderful revolutions which have ever occurred in the history of the world. . . . I have not heard of a single outrage perpetrated by the people

in this agitating crisis". . . .[1] Mr. Van Buren, secretary of state, in sending the minister's letters of credence, September 27, urged him to "explicitly state that the known sympathies of the people of the United States . . . are universally and enthusiastically in favor of that change, and of the principle upon which it was effected".[2]

President Jackson in his message to Congress, December 7, referred in glowing terms to the late revolution.

The important modifications of their Government, effected with so much courage and wisdom by the people of France, afford a happy presage of their future course, and have naturally elicited from the kindred feelings of this nation that spontaneous and universal burst of applause in which you have participated. In congratulating you, my fellow-citizens, upon an event so auspicious to the dearest interests of mankind, I do no more than respond to the voice of my country, without transcending in the slightest degree that salutary maxim of the illustrious Washington which enjoins an abstinence from all interference with the internal affairs of other nations.[3]

Long before this message set the seal of official approval on the revolution, public demonstrations in many cities had attested its popularity. Banquets, processions, orations, sometimes public holidays, marked these occasions. The President and department heads took part in the Washington celebration, while at New York, November 26, thirty thousand came from adjoining cities to see what was called the biggest fête ever held in the country.[4]

Newspaper comment, while generally reflecting the widespread popular enthusiasm, bears also the impress of differing political and economic views. The Jacksonian press was wildly extravagant. So, for example, the New York *Morning Courier and Enquirer* in its issue of September 4.

The news from France bursts upon us like the commencement of a new age—the opening of a new era—the unfolding of another roll in the history of future ages. As we read over the accounts of the brave, the great, the noble acts of Frenchmen, in their efforts to preserve the liberty of the press, the rights of man and of human nature, the blood boils within every soul—it courses the veins with redoubled velocity—and the very heart beats, as if it had received its agitations from tumults from the Palais Royal itself.

1 Rives-Van Buren despatches, no. 37, July 30, 1830, *Congressional Debates*, vol. IX., pt. II., app., pp. 264, 265.

2 Van Buren-Rives despatches, no. 17, *ibid.*, pp. 219, 220. *Cf.* no. 19, p. 220.

3 Richardson, *Messages*, II. 500. A eulogistic allusion to Lafayette, characteristic of the time, occurs in this message. *Cf. Niles' Register*, Sept. 4, 18, Oct. 2, 9; Baltimore *American*, Sept. 23.

4 New York *Morning Courier and Enquirer*, Nov. 29. *Cf.* Baltimore *American*, Sept. 7, 10, 13, 16, 28, Oct. 1, 20, 27; Charleston *Courier*, Sept. 24; *Niles' Register*, Oct. 30, Nov. 6.

The *Enquirer* feared no new Reign of Terror, but believed that the revolution would " reignite the dying flambeau of liberty throughout the continent ", whose nations were destined presently to become " a cluster of happy, heroic and glorious republics ".[5]

The Democratic press, then, was enthusiastic over the revolution, foretold its triumph and its far-reaching influence. The Whigs were more cautious. Clay's championship of the revolutions in Greece and in South America committed them to a generally favorable attitude toward popular uprisings, and such was their position in 1830. But they represented the more well-to-do, conservative elements of society; they inherited some of the old Federalist suspicion of French Jacobinism; they were instinctively hostile to any Jacksonian policy. Hence their approval of the new government was not without qualification.

The New York *Commercial Advertiser* may represent the Whig point of view. On September 8 it gave an analysis of the events leading up to the revolution, too long to summarize here. The opening sentences show its temper.

> The last intelligence from France was of such an astounding character that we have even yet hardly recovered sufficient composure to make a running commentary. Still it possesses that high degree of importance, even though the storm should pass away, as some appear to imagine it will, with the first burst of its fury, as to demand the most attentive consideration. Nor should the glow of generous enthusiasm—the first impulse of joy—which all good republicans must feel at the prospect of a wider extension of liberal principles, deter us from a calm, sober and unprejudiced survey of the real facts of the case, so far as those facts have been developed.

The *Advertiser* held that in the main France had been well governed for a monarchy, that though Charles had been obstinate, weak, and ignorant, his subjects had come close to trespassing on the king's charter rights and that the future was uncertain.[6]

The Democrats were quick to ascribe an economic motive to this Whig lukewarmness. The revolution was not enthusiastically received by

> those who put themselves forward as leaders in public society and controllers of public opinion. . . . They calculated the effect of these events upon the price of stocks—the value of cotton—the sale of corn and flour—but who imagined among them the influence of such a glorious event upon the price of human liberty?—the value of human happiness?—or on the unchangeable rights of man? Had the revolution in France

5 *Cf.* New York *Courier and Enquirer*, Sept. 4, 6, 9, 25; Charleston *Courier*, Oct. 6; Savannah *Republican*, Sept. 11, 18.

6 New York *Commercial Advertiser*, Sept. 17.

been produced by the titled men of the day—by the nobles—by the church aristocracy, we should have seen the whole aristocracy of money and church in this city vieing with each other in the race of celebration. But faugh! who among our "good society" would think of celebrating a vile, dirty revolution produced by a set of rascally, dirty workingmen; or as the *Daily Advertiser and American* would more elegantly call them, "ruffians, mere ruffians", nothing better? [7]

The views of a few leading Americans may be briefly summarized. Calhoun, already becoming estranged from Jackson, was cautious. In a letter written in October, 1830, he remarked that the revolution continued to advance "with the same admirable skill and promptness, which characterised its first movements". He feared that it would rouse the rulers of Europe to madness and despair.[8] Clay, writing in December, was more optimistic, though he too felt that the situation was not without danger, as a Bourbon had been placed on the new throne and the former ministers had not been adequately punished.[9] John Quincy Adams confided his hopes and fears to his diary, December 23, 1830. Expecting still further changes, he rejoiced, but refused to be dazzled by visions of glory that might never be realized. "Cheering approbation of the past may be coupled with ardent hope for the future without extending applause to that which is questionable in principle, or prematurely censuring that which must ultimately be revised." [10] Monroe, the last of the Jeffersonians, now in the final year of his life, retained his old ardor for revolutionary France. He wrote to Adams, January 25, 1831, that a new epoch had been opened for France and for the world. He wrote to Tammany Hall accepting its invitation to a meeting to "celebrate the late glorious revolution . . . in favor of liberty" and expressing the opinion that the leaders' moderation "affords an additional strong ground on which to confide in their success".[11] Garrison, interested in the negroes rather than the French, referred caustically to "the late dinners, and illuminations, and ovations, and shoutings, at the South, over the downfall of the French tyrant, Charles the Tenth", and the bitterness they must have excited in the slaves.[12] Benton made only a rhetorical allusion to it in connection with his fight on the Bank.[13]

7 New York *Courier and Enquirer*, Nov. 5.

8 *Correspondence of John C. Calhoun*, p. 274.

9 Henry Clay, *Works* (New York, 1904), IV. 291.

10 J. Q. Adams, *Memoirs*, VIII. 253.

11 Monroe, *Writings*, VII. 216, 220.

12 *The Liberator*, vol. I., no. 6 (1831), cited in *William Lloyd Garrison, The Story of his Life*, I. 231.

13 T. H. Benton, *Thirty Years' View*, I. 261. For later expressions of opinion, *cf.* James Buchanan's hostile attitude to the Orleanist monarchy in 1833 (*Works*,

Of the literary men, Longfellow, writing from Bordeaux in 1827, predicted a revolution,[14] but said nothing about it when it came, being interested rather in the romantic side of the Old World. Irving was vexed with himself that he chanced to be in London and had missed a great historical moment. He hastened to the coronation of Louis Philippe and was favorably impressed. He felt new life stirring within him at the opening of a new era of human progress.[15] Channing was immensely enthusiastic and hurried back from his vacation to Boston, in order to express himself fittingly in the pulpit. He was astonished and grieved at the chilly attitude of business interests, but retained his own confidence in France and her rôle of leadership in Europe. "With many, many fears, I have more hopes, it seems to me, than anybody", he wrote in September.[16] An anonymous article in the *North American Review* for July, 1831, on "The Prospect of Reform in Europe", written probably by the editor, Edward Everett, showed a remarkable grasp of the world situation. The writer felt that a movement had commenced "to be marked no doubt by great vicissitudes, to prosper and to be retarded; to be alternately the object of anxiety, admiration, fear, and hope; to be hailed with rapture, to be misrepresented, to be vilified; but destined to go on, and unfold a mighty train of the most momentous, and as we firmly trust, the most auspicious consequences". He felt that the new French monarchy marked only a transition stage toward an inevitable republic.[17] Samuel G. Howe, already a veteran of the Greek revolution, was in Paris during the July days and threw himself into the movement with characteristic ardor, being restrained by Lafayette personally from exposing himself to further danger. To him it was "that wonderful event, the pride of France, the admiration of Europe and the world".[18] Cooper, then at the height of his fame, was also in Paris. He became intimate with Lafayette, but distrusted the new

II. 387); Caleb Cushing's unshaken confidence in "the brilliant destiny of young France" (*Review of the Late Revolution*, Boston, 1833, II. 344); and Seward's narrative of Lafayette's part in the struggle and subsequent break with Louis Philippe, based on personal conversations ("Oration on Lafayette, 1834", *Works*, III. 39–41).

14 H. W. Longfellow, *Life*, I. 101.

15 Washington Irving, *Life and Letters* (New York, 1862), II. 434, 453.

16 W. H. Channing, *Memoir of W. E. Channing* (Boston, 1851), III. 300, 302.

17 Everett's sympathy for the revolution is further evidenced by his "Eulogy on Lafayette", pronounced Sept. 6, 1834, and included in his *Orations and Speeches*, I. 461, 517.

18 S. G. Howe, *Letters and Journals*, I. 376–379.

government, preferring a revised form of legitimism.[19] Bryant, his close friend, was more hopeful. As editor and owner of the *Evening Post*, he signed and supported calls for public meetings in behalf of the European revolutionists. To him Garnier-Pagès wrote for information as to the American system of government, which " furnishes us the model that we wish to imitate ".[20]

Thus, while the statesmen were generally cautious, the men of letters were decidedly enthusiastic. In this they represented the bulk of popular feeling, in North and South alike, though the Democrats were more ardent than the Whigs and the moneyed classes stood aloof. Five years later the situation had changed radically; President Jackson had brought us to the verge of war with France over the claims controversy; it was Clay and Calhoun who, urging moderation, seemed more pro-French than he. But the contrast is less significant when one recalls how different were revolutionary and Orleanist France.[21]

By 1848 America had made notable strides along the lines already suggested in 1830. The interest in the new West had become a passion. The desire for expansion combined with economic and patriotic motives to produce war with Mexico over Texas and serious disagreement with England over Oregon. These were now at an end and a certain complacency over the results and future prospects tinged the mental attitude of the day. " Peace, plenty, and contentment reign throughout our borders ", wrote President Polk in his fourth message, December 5, 1848, " and our beloved country presents a sublime moral spectacle to the world." Jacksonian crudeness had been softened a little, but not much, though the figure of the slaveholder was looming larger than the frontiersman and exuberant democracy had yielded to a naïve materialism. The Abolitionist movement was important and there were various social experiments, but the mass were far more interested in the nation's rapid strides toward wealth and power than in radicalism. With these qualifications, however, the country still kept so much of its early simplicity and its traditional enthusiasm for a republic *per se*, that the American attitude toward France in the first months of 1848 differed only slightly from that in 1830.

19 Mary E. Phillips, *Life of James Fenimore Cooper*, p. 236; *cf.* W. C. Bryant, " Commemorative Discourse on Cooper ", in *Prose of Bryant* (New York, 1901), I. 313; T. R. Lounsbury, *James Fenimore Cooper*, p. 111.

20 Parke Godwin, *Life of W. C. Bryant*, I. 261.

21 For a more extended treatment of the general subject, see E. N. Curtis, " La Révolution de 1830 et l'Opinion Publique en Amérique ", in *La Révolution de 1848*, XVII. 64–73, 81–118.

Mr. Rush, the American minister, went even further than Mr. Rives. Counter to the advice of Lord Normanby, his British colleague, he separated himself from the diplomatic body by practically acknowledging the republic on his own account, February 28. This action was approved by his government in a letter from Mr. Buchanan, secretary of state, March 31, which also informed him that it was "with one universal burst of enthusiasm that the American people hailed the late glorious revolution in France in favor of liberty and republican government".[22] Mr. Buchanan gave the French much kindly counsel as to the advantages of a federal system, believing that Rush would be called upon frequently for advice by the new leaders and that his intimate knowledge of our government enabled him to impart valuable information to the French authorities. Three days earlier, a joint resolution was offered in the Senate by Mr. Allen, a Democrat of Ohio, tendering the congratulations of Congress to the French people on their new republic. Hale of New Hampshire proposed an antislavery amendment, congratulating the French on emancipating the slaves of their colonies, which was ultimately defeated, 28–1. Calhoun wanted to lay the Allen resolutions on the table as premature, but his motion was defeated, seven Whigs and seven Democrats voting for it, eight Whigs and twenty-one Democrats against it. Stephen A. Douglas favored the resolutions as expressing general American sentiment. President Polk's message, April 3, declared that "the world has seldom witnessed a more interesting or sublime spectacle than the peaceful rising of the French people, resolved to secure for themselves enlarged liberty, and to assert, in the majesty of their strength, the great truth that in this enlightened age man is capable of governing himself". Mr. Rush's recognition "meets my full and unqualified approbation". Allen's request for immediate consideration of his resolutions was lost by one vote, nineteen Democrats and two Whigs being in favor of it, six Democrats and sixteen Whigs opposed. They were, however, passed with a slight change in phraseology on April 3, the vote (19–13) being immediately made unanimous. Similar resolutions were offered in the House, where two antislavery amendments precipitated a long and bitter wrangle on that subject, though the Senate resolutions were finally concurred in, 174–2, two Northern Whigs casting the negative votes. An attempt to reconsider, the following day, was defeated, 123–46, all of the latter being Whigs.[23] Jefferson Davis in the Senate and Abraham Lincoln in the House voted in favor of the

[22] *Niles' Register*, LXXIV. 98.

[23] *Congressional Globe*, 30 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 549, 579–581, 590–592, 598–604.

resolutions. The French were greatly impressed by what they considered the unprecedented action of Congress, and the National Assembly by rising vote offered the American people the thanks of the republic.

As in 1830, public meetings and parades were held in the chief American cities, though the celebrations seem to have been less elaborate.

The early expressions of newspaper opinion were generally favorable, irrespective of party. Thus the New York *Daily Globe* (antislavery Democrat) declared on March 21: "From one end of the Union to the other, our people will sympathize with the people of France in their efforts to rid themselves of a miserable and expensive monarchy"; and on the twenty-second: "The more we reflect upon the astounding news from France, the more certain we are that great country and her millions of people have seen her last monarch." The Albany *Argus* (Democrat) rejoiced on the twenty-eighth that the republic had at last become "a reality, a certainty, a fixed fact". The New Orleans *Picayune* (Democrat) would have been filled with exultation, could it have been certain that the new government would follow a wise policy. However, "this revolution has been consummated so easily, that we have an abiding faith that it will lead to great results".[24] The Charleston *Courier* (Democrat) had "every confidence in the people who have thus carried out a comparatively bloodless revolution".[25] The Savannah *Republican* (now a Whig paper) assured its readers on the twenty-seventh that the unhappy sequel of the first revolution would not be repeated. "We hope and predict a more auspicious termination to the present one, and as France, in the darkest hour of our great struggle for freedom, stretched out a cordial hand—cheered us with her sympathy, and lent us a Lafayette, gratitude, if no stronger feeling, should prompt us heartily to join our voices to the loud acclaim which sounds over the sea, and to foreign lands the tidings at last FRANCE IS FREE." The New York *Tribune* (Whig) grew lyrical over "the great revolution" which "so immeasurably transcends in importance and in promise any other event of the last ten years that it must be idle for some time to seek to win public attention to anything else".[26]

There was one notable exception to this chorus of praise. The Washington *National Intelligencer*, formerly the official Whig paper, was hostile from the start. "The sympathies of disinterested auditors

[24] New Orleans *Picayune*, Mar. 26.

[25] Charleston *Courier*, Mar. 29.

[26] New York *Tribune*, Mar. 21.

of the news will, we should think, be rather with the Government, which has become obnoxious to the Revolutionary party chiefly from its successful exertions to keep France out of war and to maintain undisturbed the peace of Europe." It felt that "almost the whole body of our own countrymen would deeply lament such a revolution as would throw all the political elements of France into chaos", with the chance of getting a much worse government, ending in a probable despotism.[27] On the twenty-seventh, the paper printed a five and a half column editorial, entitled "The Revolt of Paris", defending its own attitude against the assaults of the Washington *Union*, Polk's paper, and bitterly attacking the revolution. More than once mob spirit in one city begot a similar spirit in another, asserted the editor.

> But we are free to confess that we *have* been surprised at the expressions of delight with which this news has been hailed—without distinction of party, let us say—by many of our countrymen, who, without waiting for the sequel of the story, appear to regard the triumph of the mere Mob over the established authority of the Governments of both City and Nation, as something won for the principles of free government; when, had they duly considered the subject, they would have perceived that this installation of Mob Government in the place of a Government of Law and Order, is almost as likely to end in making the city of Paris the tomb as the temple of Freedom—in contracting and restraining, as in enlarging, the liberties of the French.

The constitution of 1830 had been annihilated without premeditation at the bidding of God knows whom. Polk was a worse tyrant than Louis Philippe, who had been superseded by a self-created despotism of six of the revolters. The *Intelligencer* confessed its utter lack of confidence in the duration of the new government. Civil and foreign war were likely. "None but people with the heads of demagogues and the hearts of jacobins can think of it without shuddering." This editorial seems to have created wide discussion. The Washington correspondent of the Albany *Argus,* who dubbed himself a radical Locofoco, denounced its monarchist tone and affirmed that "Federal politicians", appreciating American sympathy for republicanism, were really trembling that such sentiments had been expressed in their national organ, which must strike nine-tenths of Americans as more suited to an organ of Guizot, Metternich, or Nicholas.[28] The *Intelligencer* presently felt constrained to take note of a Southern senator's statement that the organ of a large and respectable party had "in the most solemn and formal manner expressed sentiments hostile to the movements in favor of freedom in France"; it disavowed any knowl-

27 Washington *National Intelligencer,* Mar. 21.

28 Albany *Argus,* Mar. 31.

edge of the views of the Whigs as a party and thought it quite possible that many Whigs disapproved its position.[29]

It is well known that among the earliest decrees of the provisional government were those establishing national workshops and abolishing negro slavery in the colonies. When this news reached America, the effect on press comment was instantaneous. At once a split took place, not along strict party lines, but between radicals and conservatives, alike on the slavery issue and on the broader question of economic theory. The Southern papers, previously sympathetic, took alarm. Thus the Savannah *Republican* of April 4:

> The greatest danger that now seems to menace the young Republic, is the anxiety of its directors *to do too much.* Not content with what they have achieved of national freedom, they seem disposed to rush into *Socialism,* and that still more cruel absurdity of immediately emancipating the slaves in all the Colonies of France. We sincerely trust that the "sober second thought" of their statesmen may induce them not to mar their great triumph, and the respect of foreign nations, by the adoption of measures at once so visionary and so fatal in their consequences to the well-being of the Republic.

In its issue of April 15, a hostile account of French radicalism was quoted at length from the English *Willmer and Smith's Times,* warning American merchants to consign no property to French ports at present and asserting that the revolution had annihilated the foreign trade of France. From this time on, the *Republican* loses interest in French affairs, though on the twenty-fourth it warned its readers against the exaggerations of English papers and reiterated that, in spite of the early follies and absurdities of the new government, as long as Lamartine and his friends remained at the helm it would not despair of the republic. The Charleston *Courier* of April 7 printed a letter from its Paris correspondent in which the decree on labor was called one "impossible to realize, and which ought not to be realized if it could be", while that on slavery, it was said, dictated by the impulse of the moment, would be considered by philanthropists, no less than by politicians, "more generous than wise". In its issue of the seventeenth, its Washington correspondent wrote that many persons had two sets of opinions on the revolution; while they would express no doubt in public as to the capacity of the French for self-government, they informed their confidential friends that France would hardly adhere long to any constitution, being too easily led into war. The New Orleans *Picayune,* while scoffing at the exaggerations of *Willmer and Smith's Times,* on April 19, came out the following day with a frightened editorial headed "Ledru-Rollin

[29] *National Intelligencer,* Apr. 3.

Ultraism in France ". The Washington *Intelligencer* was triumphant. To it the new economic decrees were repugnant to every idea of the reign of law and illustrated the ascendancy of popular force, while it ventured to doubt whether emancipation was "either a wise, well-timed or humane measure ".[30]

Northern papers, representing the conservative Whig element, were more gloomy than those of the South, which were perhaps partially held in line by the attitude of President Polk.[31] The New York *Commercial Advertiser* of April 8 felt that the situation was getting worse, the comparative tranquillity was but "the ominous pause that precedes the wildest fury of the storm ", the blouses were winning at the expense of the bourgeoisie, the weakness of the government was manifest, while "the upturning and overthrow of all industrial movement, the universal disorganization of the commercial, financial and manufacturing interests, the wild commotion that reigns supreme " were more fully revealed in private and mercantile correspondence than in the public accounts.[32] On the other hand, the Albany *Argus*, a pro-Southern Democratic paper, which did not follow its old leader, Van Buren, into the Free Soil camp, merely remarked that it was a significant fact that Hale's antislavery amendment to the resolutions of congratulation received just one vote, his own.[33]

Meanwhile radical or antislavery papers, whether Whig like the *Tribune* or Democratic like the *Globe*, supported the French movement with added fervor. The *Tribune* on April 12 asserted: "Democracy in France proclaims the absolute incompatibility of its principles with the toleration of Human Slavery, and decrees the prompt overthrow of that shameful scourge. Party Democracy here is the avowed and boasted ally of Slavery, and is even now battling to plant and extend Slavery in territory hitherto Free." Both vigorously attacked their opponents, even though belonging to the same party. Thus the Whig *Tribune* sarcastically remarked on April 5 that the New York *Courier and Enquirer* and the *Express* (both conservative Whig papers in 1848) found little consolation in the existing state of affairs. "We regret, for the sake of our Wall st. neighbor, if not of the Provisional Government of France, that we must take the little

30 *Ibid.*, Apr. 3. *Cf.* the hostile letter of the *Southern Literary Messenger's* Paris correspondent (XIV. 657–663).

31 Yet even the Washington *Union* confessed that the provisional government might fall into some errors and that in one movement "we do not exactly agree with it ", though allowance must be made for the "prejudices of the European latitude ". Cited in New York *Tribune*, Apr. 14.

32 Cited in Washington *Intelligencer*, Apr. 10.

33 Albany *Argus*, Apr. 8.

confidence which the former retains in the latter down a peg still." Lamartine had declared against Communism, it was true, but by no means against Fourierism, a very different thing.[34] In like manner, the New York *Globe* of April 6 fiercely attacked Calhoun's position. His idea of Democracy did not make it incompatible with slavery. The new French decree could not of course meet his approval. "This fact alone will be likely to induce the Slaveocracy of the United States to regret the Revolution in France." And on April 7: "Occasionally, an editor of a Federal paper expresses doubts about the wisdom of the French Revolutionizers. A few slave-holders are not yet ready to congratulate the French people, because they are determined to abolish slavery in their colonies. . . . The *Argus,* Mr. Calhoun and other advocates of the slave power, may endeavor to dishearten the friends of liberty, but we tell them there is no fear of monarchy in France."

Turning to individual opinions, it is clear that President Polk was as enthusiastic as his predecessor had been in 1830.[35] It is equally obvious that Calhoun, now as then, was distrustful. His views are fully set forth in a dozen letters written between March and July.[36] It is rather surprising that in these nothing appears in regard to the French decrees concerning slavery or labor. France was not prepared for a republic, he felt. She had here much sympathy, but little confidence among the thinking. The 1848 revolutions showed that Europe had not advanced beyond Dorrism, or the right of a majority to overturn a constitution at its pleasure. The chance of a stable situation developing in Germany was more hopeful, due to her federal system. France was trying to go back to the liberty of the state of nature, before the formation of society. Abolitionism in this country was based on a similar error. Should the French republic fail, he saw no alternative but an imperial government. With great relief he hailed the defeat of Chartism as the turning-point in European affairs. Webster was equally skeptical. In a letter dated July

[34] It is interesting to note that the *Tribune* rejoiced in Cavaignac's victory in June, while pitying the "misguided laborers" and printing a long letter sympathetic with them from its Paris correspondent, Charles A. Dana. In the same issue (July 14), it indignantly denies the imputation of its old adversary, the *Express,* that it had changed its ground, and calls attention once more to the distinction between Fourierism and Communism.

On the division between radical and conservative Whigs, *cf.* J. D. Hammond, *Political History of the State of New York,* II. 482, and De A. S. Alexander's work under the same title, II. 116. The Washington *Intelligencer* followed the leadership of Webster, the *Tribune* supported Clay.

[35] J. K. Polk, *Diary,* III. 413.

[36] Calhoun, *Correspondence,* pp. 746–760.

12, he makes his only contemporary reference to the subject. France could be governed only by a fierce democracy or an emperor; a constitutional government could never last long there. Her present rulers were poets and editors; few, if any, were men of affairs. They undertook to guarantee employment and property to all; how could any government fulfill such a promise?[37] Clay took the opposite position, though guardedly. To Samuel Haight he wrote on April 15:

> I concur with you in regretting the course of the "*National Intelligencer*" in regard to the French Revolution; but I think it ought not to operate, and I hope it will not to the prejudice of the Whig party. The editors expressly disclaim being the organ of that party, and the resolutions of congratulation to the French people have been passed, in both houses of Congress, by almost unanimous votes. My own opinion is, that our sympathies and congratulations were due to the French people for the Revolution which they had effected. In expressing these sentiments, we should not have been committed to the sanction of any future excesses which may be perpetrated in the progress of the revolution, if any such should unfortunately occur. . . . No one can doubt my feelings and sympathies who has any recollection of the course which I took in regard to the Spanish American Republics, and to Greece.[38]

The young Free Soilers were of course more enthusiastic than the elder statesmen. Typical of these were Tilden and Sumner. The former, in his address to the Democratic members of the New York legislature, April 12, 1848, known as "the first gun for free soil", asked his hearers what American heart did not expand with pride and gratitude when a prayer for institutions like ours was the first voice that arose from regenerated France; to him the new republic was clearly justified in breaking down the obstacles which had so long kept labor from receiving its due rewards.[39] Charles Sumner, in a series of letters to his brother George during April and May, made it clear that he regarded the revolution as the greatest event ever accomplished in so short a time. American sympathy was strongly in favor of it, but

> the rich and the commercial classes feel that property is rendered insecure, and with many of these the pocket is the chief sensorium. Mr. Webster, I am told, condemns this revolution, saying it is a movement

[37] Webster, *Writings and Speeches* (Boston, 1903), "Private Correspondence", II. 280. *Cf.* also XIV. 620–623, a despatch to the American minister, sent by Webster as secretary of state, on the occasion of Louis Napoleon's *coup d'état* in 1851. He there reviewed the causes of the republic's failure, admitted that most Americans were in no hurry to recognize the new régime, but directed him to do so, in line with American diplomatic tradition, as soon as the French election had taken place.

[38] Clay, *Works* (New York, 1904), V. 560.

[39] Samuel J. Tilden, *Writings and Speeches*, II. 560, 572.

of communists and socialists. . . . The feeling in Boston is counter to the revolution. This movement is in advance of the sentiment here. The commercial interest is disturbed by the shock that property has received. John E. Thayer, the rich broker, who has risen since your day, tells me that he regards France as a "wreck". I suspect that he speaks the opinions of his class. Mr. Cabot told me that I was the first person he had seen who had hope in the future of France.[40]

Of the intellectuals, Whittier was naturally enthusiastic, especially on the antislavery decree,[41] Lowell was moved to song,[42] Emerson was rather skeptical, chiefly on the Socialist issue,[43] Bryant was hopeful, though he had some apprehensions,[44] Horace Greeley was confident,[45] Margaret Fuller gratified by Rush's promptness,[46] Howe wrote *Liberté, Égalité, Fraternité* under the entry of his son's birth in the family Bible,[47] George Ticknor was definitely hostile.[48] Among Southern writers, J. P. Kennedy, a Whig, and W. G. Simms, a slavery man, disliked the French in general and the revolution in particular. The former had unpleasant visions of "that gentlest of sucking doves, the mob of Paris, sacking the Tuilleries", while wages went up one hundred per cent. and rents came down fifty per cent.;[49] the latter could not regard as the focus of civilization a land in which occurred "revolutions that are never natural or gradual—never harmless and never beneficial". . . .[50]

40 Pierce, *Memoir and Letters*, III. 37.

41 Whittier, *Life and Letters*, I. 330.

42 "Ode to France, February, 1848"; "To Lamartine".

43 Emerson, *Journals*, VII. 322, 403, 409, 431, 454, 460, etc. He visited Paris during May and found the trees all cut down for barricades. "At the end of a year we shall take account, and see if the Revolution was worth the trees" (p. 452).

44 Godwin, *Life of Bryant*, II. 35.

45 L. D. Ingersoll, *Life and Times of Horace Greeley* (Philadelphia, 1874), p. 245.

46 Greeley, *Recollections of a Busy Life*, p. 185.

47 Julia Ward Howe, *Reminiscences*, p. 193.

48 Ticknor, *Life, Letters, and Journals*, II. 230–236. Later expressions of sympathy for French republicanism, dating from 1852 and 1853, may be found in W. H. Seward, *Works*, I. 186; Wendell Phillips, *Speeches, Lectures, and Letters*, pp. 47, 84; Harriet Beecher Stowe, *Sunny Memories of Foreign Lands* (Boston, 1854), II. 408–415.

49 H. T. Tuckerman, *Life of J. P. Kennedy*, p. 407.

50 "Guizot's Democracy in France", *Southern Quarterly Review*, XV. 114–165 (April, 1849). This article, though anonymous, is definitely assigned to Simms, the editor, by his biographer, W. P. Trent (*W. G. Simms*, pp. 190, 340). In the July, 1848, issue there appeared an article on "The French Republic", which, while denouncing Louis Philippe and asserting that the provisional government undoubtedly labored with honest intentions, sharply criticized its decrees taking control of the railways, abolishing slavery, establishing workshops, etc., and saw little hope of a stable republic. The article, signed "C.", may perhaps be by Milton Clapp, editor from 1847 to 1849 and Simms's predecessor.

Thus in 1848 as in 1830, the official attitude of the government and the feeling of the people in general were friendly to the revolution, while the wealthy and conservative were critical, if not openly hostile. The Democrats remained on the whole more favorably disposed than the Whigs, but the line of cleavage ran rather across than parallel with party divisions, coinciding in this respect with the new alignment regarding negro slavery. As the French republic in its decrees on this subject and its earlier tendency toward socialistic experiment touched more controversial issues than in 1830, the tone of American comment on the negative side was distinctly more embittered.

The revolution of 1870 like that of 1830 turned, in the view of America, on the personality of an individual. As the earlier movement gained favor from the popularity of Lafayette, who seemed to us its leader, so the later was judged in terms of Napoleon III., whom it overthrew. American opinion of Napoleon III. was determined largely by three circumstances, his *coup d'état,* his attitude during the American Civil War, and his Mexican expedition.

The *coup d'état* was generally unpopular in this country. The Second Republic had already thrown off its Socialist associations and had settled down to a bourgeois conservatism, soothing to the fears of its American critics. Its violent replacement by an empire seemed needless and ran counter to our traditional sympathy for the republican form of government.

Far more important, however, was Napoleon's marked friendliness for the South during the Civil War. Space forbids a thorough analysis of his attitude and its reasons. Some of the factors were doubtless the instinctive sympathy of Bonapartism for an aristocratic society, imbued as was supposed with military spirit, the menace of a strong, hostile United States adjacent to his Mexican empire, the old connection with Louisiana, antipathy to the blockade for economic reasons, and perhaps the fact that the Orleanist princes and the French republicans favored the North.[51]

The Mexican expedition, begun for dynastic reasons, had as one of its objects to prevent the expansion of the United States over the

[51] For this period the authority is John Bigelow, consul at Paris 1861–1864, minister to France 1864–1866. On the Orleanist princes, *cf.* his *Retrospections of an Active Life*, I. 512, 520; on the French republicans, I. 385, II. 499, 598; on other anti-imperialists, I. 533–536, II. 65–69, 88, 219, III. 3–44. For Bigelow's account of Napoleon's attitude, see II. 252 and *passim*; also L. M. Sears, "A Confederate Diplomat at the Court of Napoleon III.", in *Am. Hist. Rev.*, XXVI. 255–281, and a despatch by Slidell to his government in Bigelow, *France and the Confederate Navy*, pp. 135–138.

whole continent.[52] The plan of setting up a European monarchy in Mexico under a Spanish, French, or Austrian prince was proposed by a member of the French legation in Mexico, in a book published during 1844. The right of French intervention to protect "the independence of states and the equilibrium of the great political forces in America" was asserted by Guizot, as foreign minister, in the Chamber of Deputies the following year.[53] But all this had been forgotten, if it was ever generally known, and the odium of setting up a foreign monarchy in our sister state attached itself to Napoleon personally rather than to French policy in general. Feeling on our side rose so high that war was regarded as a possibility.[54] A revolution in France was freely predicted in Bigelow's letters to the State Department as early as 1863.[55]

When war broke out between France and Prussia, American sympathy in the North was naturally on the side of Prussia, in the South on the side of France.[56] The Republican press was practically a unit, though even in the North Democratic papers tended to champion the cause of Napoleon.[57] His fall and the proclamation of the Third

[52] Napoleon's letter to General Forey; *cf.* Nicolay and Hay, *Abraham Lincoln*, VI. 33.

[53] These facts were coupled in a speech in the Senate by John A. Dix, on Jan. 26, 1848, warning the country not to withdraw its troops from Mexico until a treaty of peace had been signed, lest foreign influence, unfriendly to us, be exerted and a monarchy possibly set up. *Cong. Globe*, 30 Cong., 1 sess., p. 251. Dix, who was hostile to Napoleon at first (*Memoirs*, II. 145), became a warm friend of the imperial family, while minister to France 1866–1869 (*ibid.*, p. 150; Bigelow, *Retrospections*, IV. 390).

[54] See the comments of Henry Adams and of Seward in 1863 and 1864 in *A Cycle of Adams Letters*, II. 87, 122.

[55] *Retrospections*, II. 6; *cf.* Seward's speculations, *ibid.*, p. 142; also those of Henry Adams (reference above) and John Hay (W. R. Thayer, *Life of Hay*, I. 228, 313).

[56] It should not be forgotten that while the percentage of foreign-born in the population of the North Atlantic division of states was 20.5 in 1870, it was only .8 in the South Atlantic division. Jencks and Lauck, *The Immigration Problem* (New York, 1912), p. 467. Of these, the Germans vastly exceeded the French, there being, for example, 151,203 of the former in New York, 50,746 in Philadelphia, 49,446 in Boston, against 8240, 2471, and 615 of the latter in the same cities. Even in the South, the Germans greatly outnumbered the French (1621 to 144 in Richmond, 1826 to 97 in Charleston, 1768 to 207 in Memphis, 787 to 99 in Savannah), but were not sufficiently numerous to influence public opinion. *Statistics of Population, Ninth Census*, pp. 388 ff.

[57] The New York *Tribune*, July 25, 1870, asserts that nearly all the leading journals of the country oppose Napoleon. The New Orleans *Commercial Bulletin* of July 28 declares that the Washington administration is leaning distinctly toward Prussia and that partizan Republican papers in the North are falsely asserting that the American masses are pro-German. The Richmond *Whig* of July 19 admits that

Republic reversed the situation. Public opinion made a complete *volte-face*; the North now favored the new government, the South was hostile.

As early as August 25, the New York *Tribune* began a curious campaign for a republic.

We trust, moreover, that the people of France will utterly destroy the Napoleonic dynasty. . . . The Bonapartes have been a curse to France and to the world from first to last; and now is the opportunity to destroy them, root and branch. There is talk about the return of the Orleanists to the French throne. We cannot believe in the possibility of this. We trust it will never be realized. What we desire to see established in France at the close of this war is the *Republic!*

The following day an editorial appeared under the caption "The Republic for France", and the propaganda continued steadily. On September 7 the new government was greeted in an editorial headed "The Empire not France". With characteristic energy, Greeley paid his respects to the departed ruler.

the North is for Prussia and the South for France because of the French attitude during the Civil War and the Mexican affair. The Mobile *Daily Register* of Aug. 26 declares that "the justice of the French cause cannot be denied. . . . All of the King of Prussia's pious cant and claptrap . . . is the veriest hypocrisy". The Galveston *Tri-Weekly News* of Aug. 17, while professing neutrality, eulogized Napoleon's Italian war as "that noblest campaign yet recorded in history". The Savannah *Republican* (Dem.) of July 21 distinguishes between the pro-Prussian spirit of the Republican papers (because Napoleon "was a friend to the South in her recent struggle for independence") and the neutral or pro-French stand of the Democrats, citing editorials from the New York *Tribune* and the New York *Post* in the former sense, from the Philadelphia *Day* and the Boston *Post* in the latter. A similar list is found in the Baltimore *Sun* of July 18. This paper took a neutral stand, while the Baltimore *American*, the New York *Times*, New York *Herald*, New York *Sun*, and New York *World* favored Prussia. Southern carpet-bag papers were pro-German. So the Raleigh *Standard* of Aug. 17, which told how Prussia's "grand mission" was being assailed by Napoleon "with all the aggressive might he can command"; also the Atlanta *New Era*, boasting itself "the only Republican daily paper in the State of Georgia", which on Aug. 3 denounced Napoleon as "fraudulent and violent . . . a liar and a murderer . . . bold, bloody and resolute", etc. An indignant protest appeared in the St. Louis *Anzeiger des Westens* (quoted in the Baltimore *American* of Sept. 6), which declared in a somewhat exaggerated vein that "with the exception of the *Missouri Republican*, and a few other rather insignificant papers, the entire Democratic press in America has taken side in the present war for France". *Cf.* President Grant's letter to E. B. Washburne, Aug. 22: "The war has developed the fact here that every unreconstructed rebel sympathizes with France, without exception, while the loyal element is almost as universally the other way." *General Grant's Letters to a Friend* (New York, 1897), p. 68. Sheridan, when he told Grant that he preferred to see the war from the German lines, found that "my choice evidently pleased him greatly, as he had the utmost contempt for Louis Napoleon, and had always denounced him as a usurper and a charlatan". P. H. Sheridan, *Personal Memoirs*, II. 359.

> No fraud so gigantic ever before perished so swiftly and so utterly. The fall of the first Napoleon seems august by comparison. . . . The last Napoleon is a bad copy of his supposed uncle with the heart and brain left out. . . . Louis Bonaparte still lives; but Caesarism, whereof he was chief priest and prophet, is dead forever. It has debauched and weakened his country; it has repaid her neither with glory nor with splendor; let its putrid remains be speedily buried, and let Republican France receive the generous sympathy invoked by the disasters she has inherited and the perils by which she is environed. Hitherto, the Germans, so wantonly assailed, have had our best wishes: now, we fervently trust that their leader's heart may be inclined to peace on terms which France can accept without dishonor, and without being impatient to efface its memory in another war unto death.

On the ninth he expressed his belief that the new government was already as firmly established as the empire ever was, "and with hopes that it will do much for France and for civilization, we say, God save the French Republic!"[58] From then on, the *Tribune* pressed for an early and moderate peace, threatening Germany with a loss of sympathy if she crushed the republic. A tone of slightly pro-German neutrality marked the subsequent course of the paper.

It was inevitable that Southern editors should hold the opposite point of view. The Charleston *Courier* printed eulogistic reviews of Napoleon's career on September 3 and 7. He had governed the country with consummate wisdom, step by step increasing its liberty and diminishing his own despotic power. A French republic meant confusion, blood, and eventually the despotism of a single man. The empire was preferable to either of the royalist lines. On the fifteenth it gave its opinion that the new republic had a doubtful future. The Mobile *Daily Register* in a ferocious leader (September 13) dwelt on "the present abject condition of France—if those bloody relics over which Red Republicanism is now fighting in search of plunder, may yet be called France".[59] The Savannah *Republican* on September 8

[58] A similar position was maintained in even sharper terms by the New York *Times*, which warned Bismarck that a war directed against a Bonaparte could not be converted into a war against a republic without throwing away the moral strength of the German cause and the sympathy with which it had been previously regarded; by the New York *World*, which could not expect our German fellow-citizens to understand the emotions native Americans felt toward a French republic; by the New York *Sun*, which regarded the situation as transformed, our sympathies being again with France, our prayers and good wishes all for her complete success. See extracts from these papers in the Baltimore *Sun* of Sept. 8. This journal also favored the republic with increasing ardor (*cf.* the issue of Sept. 21), though its contemporary, the Baltimore *American*, was in some doubt as to the real feeling of the French people (*American*, Sept. 9, 14). The *Sun's* faith in the new republic was severely shaken by the events of the Commune, but survived the ordeal; *Sun*, May 24, 1871.

[59] This has no reference to the Commune, which did not begin until March, 1871.

was ready to admit that the empire was temporarily extinct, but whether it was to be permanently extinct was another question. As for the so-called republic, that was impossible.[60] The Richmond *Whig* was somewhat more friendly. The announcement of the new republic had not excited the enthusiasm among our people which such an event usually engenders. The new republic might be short-lived, but France had now become the object of sympathy and a further advance of freedom over feudalism had been made.[61] The Galveston *Tri-Weekly News* (moderate Democrat) was also friendly and was interested to see how completely the whole Republican press of the North had changed its tone; naturally the Republican Raleigh *Standard* and Atlanta *New Era* followed their party leaders.[62]

Following the precedent set in 1830 and 1848, Mr. Washburne, the American minister, was the first member of the diplomatic corps to recognize the infant republic. This he did on September 7 in obedience to cabled orders from Washington. An extremely cordial correspondence with Jules Favre followed, and for days the street in front of the legation was filled with cheering crowds, while delegations of French citizens presented addresses of thanks to the minister for his prompt support.[63] The Avenue de l'Impératrice was changed to Avenue des États-Unis.[64]

[60] *Cf.* a sarcastic editorial on Sept. 16, on the dilemma of the Washington government, twenty days ago vociferous for Prussia, now not daring to open its lips and awkwardly explaining away the President's recognition of the new republic; also (Sept. 20) a fiery denunciation of the United States as an irresponsible oligarchy, holding down half the nation by force, yet with undignified haste throwing up the national cap and telegraphing congratulations to a few French politicians who had set up a republic. These so-called French republicans had sided with the North; they had no heart at that time for a people struggling to be free and would not be worth much now to France. *Cf.* also the Memphis *Avalanche*, Feb. 11, 1870, which asserted that "the people of France are not ripe for revolution, and even if they were, M. Henri Rochefort is not the man for the occasion. He has no well-considered schemes of government to propose in the place of that administered by Louis Napoleon". There is no file of this paper in the Library of Congress after April, but this citation shows its general position.

[61] *Whig*, Sept. 9, 14.

[62] *News*, Sept. 14 and 15; *Standard*, Oct. 6 and 8; *New Era*, Sept. 6. The latter stated on Sept. 8 that "some of our State exchanges are mourning over the downfall of Napoleon". This indicates, in so far, the position of Georgia Democratic papers.

[63] E. B. Washburne, *Recollections of a Minister to France*, I. 120–125 and *passim*. It should be noted that Mr. Washburne had been personally friendly to Napoleon, and that he was acting minister of the North German Confederation in Paris, which had brought him a certain amount of unpopularity in the city. During the Commune, he was the only member of the diplomatic corps who refused to withdraw to Versailles, though he felt no sympathy with the insurrection.

[64] Baltimore *Sun*, Sept. 15.

President Grant, in his message to Congress on December 5, reported the minister's action, taken under his direction, with the following comment:

> The reestablishment in France of a system of government disconnected with the dynastic traditions of Europe, appeared to be a proper subject for the felicitations of Americans. Should the present struggle result in attaching the hearts of the French to our simpler forms of representative government, it will be a subject of still further satisfaction to our people. While we make no effort to impose our institutions upon the inhabitants of other countries, and while we adhere to our traditional neutrality in civil contests everywhere, we can not be indifferent to the spread of American political ideas in a great and highly civilized country like France.

The republic, he added, had asked us to use our good offices in the interest of peace, but we had been compelled to decline on ascertaining that the Germans were unwilling to entertain such a proposition.[65]

Congress was much more cautious than during the earlier French crises. A resolution "commending the suffering poor of France to the American people" and another providing for the use of a naval vessel to forward supplies were both passed unanimously (on February 1 and 4, 1871, respectively), but only after both had been

[65] Richardson, *Messages*, VII. 96. Certain state papers were transmitted with the message and are printed in *House Exec. Docs.*, 41 Cong., 3 sess. These include instructions of the State Department to Washburne, directing him to recognize the republic, the latter's report on his action, despatches from Secretary Fish approving Washburne's prudent conduct and laying down a policy of neutrality and friendship for both sides in the war, and a correspondence with Bancroft at Berlin, who declares with emphasis that Germany does not want our good offices. The following are of especial interest for this study. Acting Secretary Davis telegraphs Washburne Sept. 7: "Berthemy asks, under instructions from Favre, whether the public sentiment in America has changed since the change of government in France, adding on his part, that until now the Republican press in this country has expressed strong sympathy with Germany. I reply that the Government maintains a strict neutrality, and will continue so to do, that he cannot wonder the people have little sympathy for a dynasty which countenanced giving aid to rebels during our war, and tried to establish a monarchy on our southern borders; that in my judgment the feeling to which he alluded was not against France or the French people, of which he is as competent to judge as I, and that the disposition of this Government is shown in the order of the President already given, to recognize the new Government." Washburne replied on Sept. 9, addressing Secretary Fish: "About 2 o'clock p.m. yesterday M. Jules Favre called upon me in person to thank my Government in the name of that of the national defense, as well as in his own behalf, for its . . . felicitations. He again desired that I should transmit to the President and Cabinet at Washington the profound acknowledgments of the government of the national defense. I then communicated the dispatch of Mr. Davis in relation to his conversation with M. Berthemy, which I had just received. M. Favre smiled at the allusion to the attempt of the Emperor to found a monarchy on the southern borders, and replied that nothing could be more satisfactory than Mr. Davis's telegram; it was all they could desire."

amended by striking out the preamble, which recited our debt to France, and by including Germany in the scope of the acts. A further amendment by Senator John Sherman of Ohio extending our profound sympathy to the French and instructing the President to lend them "every aid, assistance, encouragement, and support consistent with the laws of nations and our treaties with other Powers, in establishing upon a firm basis a republican government", called forth a sharp debate on the relative help given us in the past by France and Germany and never came to a vote.[66]

Other manifestations of interest are astonishingly scanty. No public demonstrations appear to have taken place. Very few references can be found in letters and memoirs. Longfellow wrote to Charles Eliot Norton, September 8, 1870: "Now that the Empire is no more, let there be war no more, and *Vive la République*! for, as Emerson sings, 'God said, I am tired of kings'."[67] John Bigelow's letters expressed little faith in the new government, believing that Thiers was a Bonapartist at heart and that a more complete break with the past was necessary. For a time he had a curious hope that something might come out of the Commune, though he had no sympathy with radicalism.[68] Carl Schurz was pessimistic, but the war was not yet over and his judgment could hardly have been impartial.[69] Seward[70] and Sumner[71] visited Paris within the next two years and returned with strong hopes for the republic's stability. Lowell, intensely opposed to the empire, experienced conversion to the Third Republic somewhere between April and June, 1873.[72]

One concludes that American public opinion was in the main favorable to democratic changes in other lands, and particularly in France. The masses were enthusiastic, especially in 1830 and 1848. To this general statement two qualifications must be added as a result of the foregoing study.

In the first place, the approval was not unanimous, being affected by political, economic, and social considerations. The conservative elements in American society expressed distrust, if not active dislike, in the first two periods. The South and pro-Southern sympathizers in the North formed the opposition in the last two periods. Memories of the Reign of Terror, coupled with the menace to trade

66 *Cong. Globe*, 41 Cong., 3 sess., pt. II., pp. 847, 869, 894, 953–955.

67 *Life*, III. 155.

68 *Retrospections*, IV. 491, V. 150, 191, 405.

69 *Speeches, Correspondence, and Political Papers*, I. 519.

70 W. H. Seward, *Travels around the World* (New York, 1873), pp. 692–707.

71 Pierce, *Memoir and Letters*, IV. 538.

72 J. R. Lowell, *Letters*, II. 96, 103.

implicit in every revolution, were the causes of alarm in 1830; the socialistic threat to property rights and the emancipation decree in 1848 seemed to many still more ominous; the respective attitudes of French imperialists and republicans toward this country during the Civil War were the determining factors in our feeling toward them a decade later. The note of fear for the future, in so far as the change concerned us, gives place to the note of anger or enthusiasm based on the recollection of the recent past. Further, the vicissitudes of American politics brought it about that the Democratic party, which had championed the new French governments in 1830 and 1848, found itself on the opposite side in 1870.

In the second place, the three revolutions were received here with a diminishing rate of public interest. This may be traced partly to the successive failures of 1830 and 1848 from the standpoint of liberalism and permanence; French revolutions were becoming a twice-told tale and creating increasing skepticism. Partly it was due no doubt to the growing wealth and sophistication of American society, far removed in 1870 from Jacksonian Democracy with its somewhat naïve enthusiasms; partly again to a world-wide decline of confidence in constitutional panaceas and to the growing democracy of monarchies. It was more apparent in 1870 than in 1830 that a monarchy like Denmark or Holland was at least as satisfactory as a republic like Guatemala or Haiti.

And yet the romance between the two countries, as M. Clemenceau calls it, was not shattered. It is not only true that most Americans sympathized with the successive efforts of the French for greater freedom. The softening of Civil War memories and the rise of a new generation restored that sympathy to practical unanimity in 1914–1919, raised to new emotional intenseness by the world-menace of German imperialism. There is little doubt that it will survive the disappointments of the past decade. For it is a singularly tenacious romance and, when all is said, this materialistic America is at heart a people full of sentiment.

Eugene N. Curtis.

JACKSONIAN DEMOCRACY IN MASSACHUSETTS 1824–1848

WHATEVER may have been the political transformations in other sections of the United States, New England has been looked upon as a conservative stronghold in which a party of opposition was negligible, if one existed at all. This has been especially the accepted view of Massachusetts in the generation between 1824 and 1848, from the day when the issues of the War of 1812 had become so dulled that old Federalists and Jeffersonian Republicans could no longer maintain their separate identity to the day when the Mexican War had brought the issue of slavery and the extension of slave territory before the American people so violently that national parties began to disintegrate once more and section defied section in ominous foreboding of civil war. This quarter-century, the period of Daniel Webster's leadership, has come down to us in legend and history as a time in which Massachusetts adhered to the conservative tradition, even though other states acclaimed the frontiersman, Andrew Jackson of Tennessee, and placed him in the White House at Washington to put in practice the theories of Western democracy.

At the beginning of this period Massachusetts was approaching great economic development. At the end it had been practically transformed from an agricultural and seafaring community into a manufacturing state. Cotton-mills which had been established in the early 'twenties had expanded into corporations with millions of invested capital controlled in the financial circles of Boston. Banking institutions of the city had grown in proportion.[1] By 1848 railroad lines radiated from Boston into all parts of the state, and connections had been made over the Berkshires with Albany and the West. In place of the free-trade principles of the old merchant families, these new urban conservatives, manufacturers and railroad builders, had fixed upon Massachusetts the principle of protection. To meet the changing sentiment of his constituency, Daniel Webster had abandoned free-trade opinions. Conservative ideas, however, were still predominant in business and in social life, and most often successful at the polls.

Looking back from his old age to the days of his father, Edward Everett Hale could say readily enough that the Jacksonian party in

[1] D. P. Bailey, jr., "History of Banking in Massachusetts", in *Banker's Magazine*, 1876.

Massachusetts was "hardly more than a coterie of a few people of whom it was said . . . that they kept the party conveniently small so that there might be enough Federal offices to go around".[2] But a party which for ten years was able to win more than thirty-five per cent. of the total vote is not to be dismissed so easily.[3]

There were many people in Massachusetts who rejected the conservative leadership of Abbott Lawrence in business and Daniel Webster in politics. There were many who did not hold the sectional point of view which had produced the Hartford convention of 1814 and had approached very near to secession from the Union. Although there was a small group of office-seekers who scrambled for places at the disposal of the Democratic administrations in Washington, Democracy in Massachusetts was a large party of protest against the "aristocracy", against the leaders in fashionable society, capitalists, religious "liberals", and political conservatives. The votes for Democratic candidates came from country folk, fishermen, and poorer classes in general who sought a change in the established order of society. Between 1824 and 1848 Jacksonian Democracy was essentially a rural party in rebellion against the domination of urban wealth and social position.

That old radical elements should go into the new Democratic party was natural. Those country folk, whose fathers in Antifederalist days had opposed the adoption of the Constitution, those old Jeffersonian Republicans who had objected to Federalist domination over a "consolidated" government, found that their convictions led them into Jacksonian Democracy. Jeffersonian prejudice against the "well born" coincided with Jacksonian suspicion of "aristocrats".[4] With such traditional opinions were joined those of the younger generation whose fancies were caught by the glamour of theoretical democracy. Among them George Bancroft was the outstanding figure. Although his friends, George Ticknor and Edward Everett, returned from their studies in European universities without loss of conservative opinions, the influence of German metaphysics upon Bancroft seems to have been great, for he came back to resume his friendships in conservative social circles with a democratic idealism which not only pervaded his historical writing but determined his political course.[5] All three gave to American thought a contact with German ideas

[2] M. A. DeW. Howe, *Life and Letters of George Bancroft* (1908), I. 214n.

[3] Election figures cited in this paper are taken from the official reports filed in the State House at Boston.

[4] W. H. Robinson, *Jeffersonian Democracy in New England* (1916); A. E Morse, *The Federalist Party in Massachusetts* (1904).

[5] Howe, *Bancroft*, vol. I., ch. IV.

that stimulated the Transcendentalism of their friends, William Ellery Channing and Ralph Waldo Emerson.[6]

This radical Unitarianism asserted the " inalienable worth of man " and, accordingly, became active in the cause of antislavery and all reforms which aimed to better the lot of humanity. Emerson decried the long hours and small pay of the Irish laborer on the railroad near Concord. He pointed a finger of scorn at the religion of his aristocratic friends: " Boston or Brattle Street Christianity is a compound of force, or the best Diagonal line that can be drawn between Jesus Christ and Abbott Lawrence." Lawrence was " fully possessed with that hatred of labor, which is the principle of progress in the human race ", and so, like his Southern acquaintances, he bought slaves, the Irishmen who worked in his growing cotton-mills.[7] But Emerson and Channing were bound to the conservative order by too many ties of culture and family ever to abandon their associates and join the Democrats. Transcendentalists of lesser note, however, participated openly in Democratic activities. Transcendentalism gave immeasurable assistance as an assailant of conservatism. It was a movement independent of Democracy working to the same end.

Religious training had much to do with determination of political conviction. Conservatism in politics found a counterpart in the Unitarianism which Emerson scorned. Its advocates were not enthusiastic for suppositions; they tried to look upon things as they were. Their faith was essentially cautious. They had turned away from acceptance of the Trinitarian concept of God in search of a rational basis for belief. Maintaining strongly a fundamental adherence to belief in God, they tried to arrive at that belief through testing the evidence without resort to faith. Application of this method to Biblical evidence for the divinity of Christ had not satisfied them that the incorporation of Greek philosophical concepts of the Trinity into Christian theology was warranted. They strove to be realists. Their historian declared that theirs was " the religion of unadorned good-sense ". He admitted that they were influenced in politics by Webster, Lawrence, and their commercial interests but asserted that they were " staunch Whigs, hated the very name of Jefferson, dreaded Democracy, abhorred what they called Jacobinism, which seemed to them allied with ' infidelity ', and were strenuous upholders of Union and peace ".[8] With such an attitude toward

[6] H. C. Goddard, *Studies in New England Transcendentalism* (1908); G. Ticknor, *Life, Letters, and Journals* (1909).

[7] Emerson, *Journals*, VI. 443, VII. 197, 300.

[8] O. B. Frothingham, *Boston Unitarianism*, p. 197.

religious truth, cautiousness in things material and social, in politics, was naturally related. The conservative Unitarians of Massachusetts from whom the radical Unitarians, or Transcendentalists, drew apart were the backbone of the successive conservative parties, Federalist, National Republican, and Whig.

In contrast, the Trinitarian sects, orthodox Congregationalists, and dissenting Baptists, Quakers, and Methodists, were as essentially evangelical in character and missionary in spirit. They were enthusiastic in acceptance of their belief. They strove to correct the moral errors of the world. It was but natural for them, therefore, to appreciate political protests against the established social and economic order. For that reason, there is added significance in the fact that most of the Democratic leaders were associated with the orthodox Congregational, Baptist, or Methodist churches and that they were educated at Brown University rather than at Harvard. This circumstance of course should not be taken to mean that Brown was peculiarly controlled by Democratic influence nor that Unitarians and conservatives were excluded from its halls. It means rather that Massachusetts families of evangelical faith distrusted the Unitarian atmosphere of Harvard as "atheistic" and, since Yale College in Connecticut was too far removed from their homes, often sent their sons to Brown in Rhode Island nearby. That their sons became leaders in the Democratic party of Massachusetts would seem to indicate the close sympathy of orthodoxy and Democratic political principles.[9]

Although traditions, political theories, and religious predilections have much weight in determining party preferences, the character of parties nevertheless depends largely upon economic interest and social position. In Massachusetts the National Republican party, and its successor, the Whig party, drew support from the propertied classes and those who were dependent upon them. Financiers, ship-owners, merchants, and manufacturers dominated both National Republican and Whig organizations. Shopkeepers and native laborers, and other urban elements, followed the lead of their wealthier neighbors, bankers, and employers. In country districts and small towns, the conservative parties were recruited from the squirearchy, or the well-to-do farming class, and their dependents.

Shut off from such resources, Democracy found active leaders among the small merchants and bankers who were not included in

[9] The names of Democratic politicians collected from newspapers of the time have been checked with lists of students at Brown. See the biography of Horace Mann by his wife (1891), I. 18.

the larger industrial projects. For its following, the Democratic organization had to look to the rural elements which were not dominated by the squires, to the seafaring folk who had no capital to invest in merchantmen and whalers, and to the newcomers.

The largest group in the Democratic party was the small farming class of the western and southern counties, which, because of inferior soil or loss of markets or envy of the increasing wealth of urban classes, was discontented with its lot and hostile to the party in power. An examination of the physiography of Massachusetts will reveal the fact that Berkshire and Hampden counties, lying in the western part of the state, have less river-bottom land than other sections. These two localities usually went Democratic.[10] Such a relationship is highly suggestive that inferior soil created discontent and that discontent was likely to develop into Democratic conviction, but it cannot be claimed of course that the process was invariable or that Democratic opinion was developed from no other source. The case of the Middlesex region near Boston alone may be cited in contradiction. No other county in the state, perhaps, had better soil than that which made up its farms, but to a surprising degree Democratic opinion was prevalent. Antagonism toward the city of Boston had existed from colonial times, but as manufacturing developed and the wealth of such financiers as the Lawrences and Appletons increased, hostility between country and city was heightened. As these capitalists acquired commanding positions in the conservative party, rural elements which were irked by such accumulations of wealth gathered in the opposition and protested against " corporations " and " exclusive privileges ". In this case, rural hostility toward the urban society of neighboring Boston and skillful leadership of that feeling had more to do with creating a Democratic party in Middlesex.

The loss of markets to which they were accustomed to send their produce went far to explain the growth of Democratic sentiment in those rural districts of Worcester County through which the Western Railroad passed to connect Boston with New York, Ohio, and the region of the Great Lakes. Cheaper food-stuffs poured into the metropolis, and the farmers of Massachusetts were unable to compete with Western producers. In addition, Whig administrations extended the credit of the state to aid the private owners of the railroad. Although deriving little benefit, the farmers were called upon for taxes to pay interest upon the state bonds. During the early 'forties Democratic newspapers made capital of this situation and

10 This assertion is based upon a comparative study of the election returns.

with considerable success, for in that period Democracy reached its greatest strength.

Besides the country people there were two other elements in the Democratic party. The fisherman of Gloucester, Marblehead, or Cape Cod held himself aloof from the wealthy merchant whose ships sailed past his small boat to the markets of the world, and his envy found vent in the rival political party. As early as 1828 the newcomers from Ireland were gathered under Democratic leadership and throughout the Jacksonian period they were an increasing factor in Democracy. That they should choose to affiliate with Democrats rather than with the dominant group in Massachusetts can be explained to some extent from the conditions which urged them to leave their native land. Feeling that they had been oppressed by an established order of wealth and social position in which they did not share, they were easily led to believe, under clever Democratic persuasion, that the "aristocracy" of merchants and manufacturers was as hostile as their former landlords in Ireland.[11] Furthermore, they came to Massachusetts in poverty and soon filled the poorhouses, jails, and asylums out of all proportion to their number.[12] A party which declared itself as the champion of the poorer classes, and contended for their welfare, and assailed the privileges of the rich, made an especially strong appeal to these newcomers from Ireland. In brief, the mental attitude of the Irish immigrant prepared him to understand and accept the philosophy of Jacksonian Democracy. His interests as a laborer found nothing discordant in the principles of Democracy. Rather, his presence soon aroused the enmity of native Whig laborers. He could not associate comfortably with them in the same political party, if he wished, and there is no evidence that he so desired.

In these years from 1824 to 1848 some readjustments of party strength were noticeable. There were well-defined areas in which the Democratic leaders marshalled regular majorities; in other localities they had varying success, and in some, they never threatened conservative dominance. In the Cape Ann region and Essex County, lying to the north of Boston, once a solid conservative area upon which the "Essex Junto" of Federalist merchants were accustomed to depend, there appeared a Democratic vote sufficient to carry Gloucester, Marblehead, Lynn, and neighboring towns at nearly every

[11] A Democratic politician who appealed to the early Irish immigrants was Andrew Dunlap, of Scotch-Irish parentage. His papers are preserved in the Essex Institute at Salem, Mass.

[12] Shattuck, *Census of Boston*, 1845, pp. 37, 110; *Census of Massachusetts*, 1855, pp. 98–132; P. H. Fowle, "Boston Daily Papers, 1830–1850" (MS. Radcliffe College).

election. Along with its compact conservatism, Essex also lost that leadership which had characterized it in the Federalist period. The absorption of its merchants into the larger urban society of Boston perhaps explains the disappearance of Essex as a distinct political area, but Lynn and its neighbors came into Democratic ranks by way of Antimasonic opposition to conservatism—a force at work quite apart from the emigration of the wealthier merchants. The excitement following the disappearance of William Morgan in New York state during 1826 spread into New England. There, as in New York, Antimasonry quickly expressed much more than horror over the fate of Morgan. By 1831 it had developed into an independent political party revolting against the alliance of conservatism and Masonry. The Antimasons of Massachusetts saw too many Masons in public office and concluded that the secret order had contrived to put them there in collusion with the wealthy urban classes.[13]

There was increasing Democratic strength in Middlesex, to the northwest of the city of Boston. It was forecast in the free-bridge demonstration of 1827 against the wealthy. Farmers in Middlesex disliked to pay tolls on their produce for the benefit of the private owners of the Charles River bridge. In opposition to the liquor law of 1838, which forbade sales of less than fifteen gallons, Democratic feeling in Middlesex reached its height. Clearly it was a measure which discriminated against common people, and when the law was sponsored by the Whig governor, Middlesex gave a large vote to the Democratic candidate and assured his election.

The Old Colony—Plymouth, Fall River, and the Cape Cod region—displayed a growing susceptibility to Democracy. At the beginning of the period, the Democratic candidate was not well supported, even though he himself lived in this community. Antimasonry, however, broke down conservative lines in the Old Colony, as it had in Essex, and again the Democratic party was the gainer.

While in the three areas just surveyed there had been some change of political expression since the days of Jeffersonian Democracy, other sections remained much the same in the Jacksonian era. In Boston and its suburban towns of Suffolk County and the northern part of Norfolk, the conservative attitude still prevailed, and, in fact, remained supreme until long after 1848. To the west of the metropolitan area, the middle farming district, or Worcester County, was predominantly conservative, although some towns chiefly in the southern tier became regularly Democratic.

13 J. Q. Adams, "Address to the Voters of Massachusetts", Boston *Daily Advocate*, Jan. 5, 1834; G. H. Blakeslee, *History of the Antimasonic Party* (MS. in Harvard College Library); C. McCarthy, *The Antimasonic Party*.

In the Connecticut Valley, Antimasonry deeply stirred Hampshire and Franklin counties but did not lead them into the Democratic party after the manner of the Old Colony. With scarcely an exception, towns in Hampshire returned to Whig affiliations. Franklin exhibited the same general character; but there conservatism had to yield more votes to Democracy. In the same years another independent political movement—the Workingmen's party—won support among the farm-hands in Hampshire and Franklin. Since it was an agrarian movement, whose principles nearly coincided with those of Jacksonian Democracy, the Workingmen's party soon lost its separate identity; its followers augmented the radical wing of Democracy.[14]

Lying to the south and west of Hampshire and Franklin were the two Democratic strongholds—Hampden and Berkshire counties. Both were radical in politics. While the town of Springfield constantly went conservative, National Republican, or Whig, the rest of Hampden as constantly gave preference to the Democratic cause. Berkshire had many conservative towns, but as a whole during the Jacksonian period it usually gave its vote to Democracy just as it had in the days of Jefferson.[15]

A host of issues crowded one upon the other in the time when Daniel Webster was considered the spokesman for New England, and Massachusetts did not give unanimous assent to the conservative solutions for its problems. The Democratic organization throve upon its protests against the opinions of the conservatives, gathered increasing strength to itself, and finally won control of the state government before its power was shattered by the issue of slavery.

When the controversy over a new bridge between Charlestown and Boston came in 1827 to the point where the advantage of property-holders seemed to be preferred to the welfare of the community, there was formed a radical party in Boston and Middlesex to support the principle of free bridges. So intense was local feeling that the leaders of the new faction were virtually deprived of any hope of returning to old party associations. Isolated as radicals, they made the most of an opportunity offered from another quarter and became leaders in the formation of the new Jackson party. The Free Bridge organization readily became the Jackson party machine in Boston, and, when its leader, David Henshaw, a Boston druggist and banker,

14 Records in the State House at Boston.

15 These assertions in regard to the location of party strength are based upon maps of the annual elections from 1824 to 1848.

acquired the national patronage, it advanced to control of the Jackson following throughout the state.[16]

Henshaw and the Jacksonians, however, were not able to gather up all who opposed the wealthy conservatives of the state. Antimasons were in the field. Their protest against the Masonic institution aroused especially the rural areas of western and southern towns. Response came fully as much from humbler elements in the National Republican party—from the plain country folk who had been accustomed to vote for the candidates of their wealthier neighbors—as from Democrats. But it was under the leadership of old Democrats that Antimasonry gained momentum and finally succeeded in getting J. Q. Adams, former President of the United States, to be its candidate for the governorship.[17] When it lost cohesive force, as the hysteria stirred by Morgan's disappearance waned, most of the Antimasons in Massachusetts went over to the Democratic party rather than to the Whig, successor of the National Republican party, in spite of the fact that the regular Democratic organization had been directed by Masons.[18] Mr. Charles McCarthy found in his study of Antimasonry that the bulk of its following in New York and Pennsylvania went to the Whig party—that retreat of all who opposed Andrew Jackson—and he came to the conclusion that the Antimasons in Massachusetts did likewise.[19] The Antimasons of New York and Pennsylvania may have entered the Whig coalition in opposition to the executive absolutism of "King Andrew"; but their fellow partizans in Massachusetts saw a greater tyrant, closer at hand, in the wealthy conservative class of Boston, who dominated the Whig party, and after their own party had disintegrated in 1834 preferred to associate themselves with Jacksonian Democrats. Moreover, Henshaw and his Masonic friends were beginning to lose control of the Democratic organization to leaders of the "country" faction. As their power declined, the movement of Antimasons toward Democratic affiliation was accelerated. That Antimasons should turn to Democracy rather than to the conservative Whig party was natural, however, even though they had come to the Antimasonic party from old conservative sources. Antimasonry was fundamentally a demand for reform and, therefore, a strong dissolvent of conservative political sentiment.

16 See files of Boston *Statesman*, 1826–1827; J. B. Derby, *Political Reminiscences, including a Sketch of the Origin and History of the "Statesman Party" of Boston* (1835); Lincoln Papers, MSS. in Mass. Hist. Soc.

17 Proceedings of Antimasonic state conventions, 1830–1834.

18 Based on an analysis of election records in the State House, Boston.

19 C. McCarthy, "Antimasonic Party", Am. Hist. Assoc., *Annual Report*, 1902, vol. I., pp. 426, 502, 525.

Superseding Antimasonry in importance, came the question of the United States Bank. It offered a fair target as an institution of the established order, in the control of a small wealthy class. Although most conservatives upheld the Bank against the attacks of Jackson and the Democrats, many had no confidence in its president, Nicholas Biddle, and preferred to use state banks associated under the Suffolk system.[20] For similar reasons of interest in state banks, conservative Democrats assailed the Bank of the United States. Supported by a considerable group of Boston financiers, both Whigs and Democrats, Henshaw opposed the recharter of the old Bank and offered to establish another national bank in its place. A close, technical examination of his proposal might reveal that greater safeguards for the national government and its interests were provided, but it seems likely that he had in mind an institution which would protect the interest of the several states and, above all, give opportunity for investment of the capital of the "middling classes". In short, he proposed a Democratic bank to take the place of the old aristocratic institution. Radical Democrats of the country districts attacked the Bank of the United States, but they urged the elimination of banks and demanded a currency of hard money. With them soon joined the Workingmen, who denounced the Bank as the "giant monopoly", the worst of the many corporations against all of which they were bitter.[21]

When Henshaw's influence in the Democratic party was curtailed by the failure in 1838 of his Commonwealth Bank, one of Jackson's "pet banks", the radical Democrats, now increased by Antimasons and Workingmen, captured the party organization. The "country" came fully into power. The conservatives accordingly charged the Democratic party with Locofocoism, that is to say, ultra-radicalism, for which there could be only ridicule. There was, however, a marked difference of opinion between the Locofocos of New York and radical Democrats in Massachusetts. Locofocos demanded the abolition of paper currency, whether issued by state or national bank, and called for the exclusive use of gold and silver coin. Radical Democracy in Massachusetts veered off from "no bank" ideas toward governmental control of currency and finance. It came to desire the use of United States Treasury notes as paper currency and

[20] For the Suffolk system, see contemporary pamphlets issued by the Suffolk Bank; R. C. Winthrop, *Memoir of Nathan Appleton* (1862); N. Appleton, *Currency and Banking* (1841).

[21] Henshaw's memorial to Congress, *Senate Docs., 22 Cong., 1 sess., no. 37*; Bancroft's article on the Bank in the *North American Review*, XXXII. 22–64. For ultra-radical Democratic opinion of the Bank, see letter of J. B. Eldredge to George Bancroft, Sept. 20, 1834, Mass. Hist. Soc.

the establishment of an "Independent Treasury" to safeguard national revenues. Sooner or later practically all Democrats in Massachusetts, both conservative and radical, supported Van Buren's subtreasury system. In demands, however, for equal rights, better conditions for workingmen, abandonment of exclusive privileges and monopolies—whatever those catch-phrases may have meant to them—Locofocos and Massachusetts radicals were in accord.[22]

The Democrats of Massachusetts were antagonistic to the principle of protection for manufactures. The reason perhaps was that they had little capital to invest in manufacturing industries. But even if they possessed some wealth, they were more likely to have it invested in mercantile enterprises. They had more understanding with the old merchant families than with the new conservative promoters of industry. Rural Democrats opposed protective tariffs for much the same reason as their fellow partizans in the South. Massachusetts farmers felt the pinch of high prices on manufactured goods perhaps as much as Southern planters. It may be suggested, moreover, that leading Democrats appreciated the situation in which Calhoun found his section of the country and for reasons of national policy chose to support the Southern contention against high tariffs. Certain it is that there was a strong Calhoun faction among the Massachusetts Democrats from 1824 to 1848, and, although it was in retirement during the administrations of Jackson and Van Buren, it came to the fore as soon as Tyler's break with the Whigs in 1841 and 1842 gave Calhoun an opportunity to dominate national affairs.[23]

On that phase of the tariff controversy which involved nullification and Jackson's coercion of South Carolina, the Democrats were not so unanimous. In public they applauded Jackson's insistence that the Union must be preserved, but in private they revealed conflicting opinions. The conservative group which had created the Jackson machine and received control of the national patronage in the state discreetly held in abeyance their devotion to Southern principles and retained the federal offices. Henshaw's reticence spoke volumes for his real understanding with Calhoun. Leaders of rural

[22] F. Byrdsall, *History of the Loco Foco . . . Party* (1842). This was a radical Democratic faction in New York which demanded the use of hard money and abolition of corporations. See Boston *Advocate*, July 12, 1837.

[23] H. Lee, *An Exposition of Evidence . . . setting forth the Evils of the Existing Tariff Duties* (Boston, 1832), a pamphlet written by a member of an old merchant family. For Democratic opposition to protection see Boston *Statesman* files, 1830; Loring, *Hundred Boston Orators*, p. 569.

For the Calhoun faction in Massachusetts see J. B. Derby, *Political Reminiscences* and the MS. letter-books of Marcus Morton in the Mass. Hist. Soc.

Democracy sympathized to some extent with the cause of South Carolina. The letters of Marcus Morton, who was the annual Democratic candidate for the governorship and a leader of the rural faction, showed to Calhoun, however, that Morton's sympathy with minorities did not extend to small "aristocracies" and that his dislike of any aristocracy was intensified by his antipathy toward the slave system. He could not accept nullification if it was to protect those two institutions. He therefore broke from Calhoun's following and gave his support to Van Buren.[24]

The reformers who advocated the cause of temperance were supported by some leaders in the radical wing of Democracy. Those Democrats who had been reared in rural communities where orthodox religious faith was predominant were prone to be in sympathy with a moral crusade which was distinctly orthodox and evangelical. Many went further and actually participated in the campaign for abolition of intoxicating liquors. On the other hand, conservative Democrats like Henshaw and his friends in Boston opposed the propaganda against the use of wines and beers and endeavored to keep the issue out of politics. The zealots were not to be stopped, however, until on April 19, 1838, they had secured the passage of a law which prevented the sale of liquors in quantities less than fifteen gallons. No longer could the poor man buy his drinks over the bar of a saloon, while the rich man could still maintain his private stock. Overlooking the political dynamite packed into such a law, the Whig governor, Edward Everett, signed the bill and committed the Whig party to its defense on the ground that it was a general measure for the public good. The Whigs had taken up with a cause urged by Democrats, but they had not stolen Democratic thunder. The fifteen-gallon law was clearly undemocratic. A popular reaction set in. By this peculiar twist of circumstances, the Democratic candidate, once president of the temperance society, was elected governor in 1839 to abolish the temperance law.[25]

Immigrants from Ireland had come by 1827 in numbers sufficient to form a distinct laboring class, occupying a separate district around Broad Street in Boston. As they were almost all Roman Catholics, the jealousy of native labor was embittered by religious animosity.

[24] For Democratic opinion on nullification see Boston *Statesman*, Mar. 20, 1830; Derby, *Political Reminiscences*, pp. 115–117; Morton, Letter-book, I. 195, for his break with Calhoun.

[25] Woolley and Johnson, *Temperance Progress of the Century*; A. F. Fehlandt, *Century of Drink Reform* . . . ; C. C. Baldwin, *Diary*, pp. 182–347; Boston *Statesman*, 1831; Boston *Morning Post*, 1838; *Niles' Register*, LV. 196, LVII. 197, 256; *Boston Quarterly Review*, April, 1840, p. 245.

At first the Whigs scorned and then, under pressure from their laboring constituency, sharply opposed the Irish. Democratic leaders at once saw an opportunity to increase the strength of their party, and they all championed the cause of the newcomer. According to an enemy of Henshaw, the Democrats proclaimed Andrew Jackson as an Irishman, and in the campaign of 1828 "they planted their flag in the menage of Broad-street; and holding him up as the champion of the poor against the rich, they received, with 'hugs fraternal', the tenants of poor-houses and penitentiaries ".[26] Notwithstanding, the Irish were confirmed in their preference for the Democratic party by the violence of their rivals. The night attack upon the Ursuline Convent school in 1834 and the riot in Broad Street during 1837 were both due to the animosity of native Whig laborers.[27] Moreover, the Native American movement in the 'forties was an expression of Whig hostility. Both leaders and followers in the new party were drawn from Whig sources.[28] As the influx from Ireland increased prior to the Civil War, it worked a great change in the character of urban and industrial population, but the complete overturn that made Boston into a Democratic area hardly came until much later. Before the Civil War, the country was democratic and the city was conservative.

After the Workingmen's party had joined with radical Democracy in 1835, the Democratic party manifested a greater interest in the living conditions of the common people. Although its leaders had to repudiate the demand of the extremists for ultimate abolition of private property and for reversion of inheritances to the state, the organization supported the ten-hour day and made public professions of sympathy with the needs of the laboring class. Reversion of inheritances was not "democratic" in principle. It would require too much exercise of authority by the central government, whereas true Jacksonian Democracy desired fullest expression of the individual and a minimum of government. The Democratic managers, however, yielded on the question of the ten-hour day and rationalized their acceptance of such collectivism with the argument that a shorter day would result in greater development of the individual laborer.

26 Derby, *Political Reminiscences*, p. 27.

27 J. P. Munroe, *New England Conscience*, p. 117; L. Whitney, *The Burning of the Convent*, p. 22; B. F. Butler, *Autobiography*, p. 111; *Documents relating to the Ursuline Convent* (1842), containing a report of G. T. Curtis to the state legislature. P. H. Fowle, "Boston Daily Papers, 1830–1850" (MS. Radcliffe), comments upon the Broad Street riot.

28 This assertion is based on an analysis of the election returns in the State House. For "nativism" see Boston *Advertiser*, Nov. 3, 8, 1845; Boston *Times*, December, 1845; Emerson, *Journals*, March, 1845, VII. 13; Bancroft to Van Buren, Jan. 22, 1845, Mass. Hist. Soc., *Proceedings*, XLII. 434.

But they were by no means ready to accept the idea of collective bargaining by trade-unions.[29]

The cardinal purpose of Democracy was protection of the humbler and weaker members of society. It was therefore consistent for the party to initiate electoral reforms. Secrecy of the ballot, printed voting blanks, and longer voting hours were all first urged by the Democrats. On the matter of representation in the legislature, Democracy was not unanimous in desire for change. Since the rapid growth of urban communities had caused inequalities of representation, it would have been in line with democratic ideals to rearrange the system of representation so as to make it proportionate to population, but the small towns were unwilling to relinquish their advantage. Opinion on this issue, consequently, was divided not between parties but between city and country. In spite of several attempts to readjust the matter, the opposition of Democratic rural communities, in alliance with Whig, was so persistent that the democratic principle of assigning seats in the legislature according to population was rejected until after 1853.[30]

Democrats were uncertain in their enthusiasm for railroad building. Henshaw was among the pioneers who saw the possibilities of a railroad from Boston over the Berkshire hills to Albany. Together with Whig financiers he took a very active part in promoting and developing the Western Railroad which linked Boston with the West. All Democratic politicians, however, were not so ardent. When in 1838 the rural faction finally ousted Henshaw from control of the Democratic organization, it was of course sensitive to the hardships of the farmers through whose lands the Western Railroad carried western products to eastern markets. The Democratic party, accordingly, objected to the Whig policy of granting state aid to the capitalists who were promoting railroads. Not only were Democratic farmers suffering from Western competition, but rural landowners were obliged to pay taxes which seemed to be benefiting only the "aristocracy" of railroad owners. Retrenchment of state finance and restriction of railroad building, therefore, became the chief aims of the two Democratic administrations of 1840 and 1843.[31]

[29] *Boston Quarterly Review*, April and July, 1840; *Bay State Democrat*, Apr. 4, July 29, 1840; Boston *Courier*, Sept. 17, 1840, contains Morton's letter favoring the ten-hour day.

[30] Boston *Statesman*, *Morning Post*, 1831–1835; Appleton, *Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, VI. 324; S. E. Morison, *History of Massachusetts Constitution*, pp. 39–41, 50–51, 57, 58; W. G. Bean, MS. thesis (Harvard Library).

[31] J. Winsor, *Boston*, IV. 115, article by C. F. Adams; letters of Henshaw in the Ebenezer Baldwin MSS., Yale Library; J. G. Holland, *History of Western Massachusetts* (1855), I. 417; Morton's address in 1840 to the legislature, *House Doc. No. 9*, Jan. 22, 1840; *Answer of the Whig Members in the General Court*, 1840.

The controversy in Rhode Island over extension of the franchise to poorer classes culminated in the "Dorr War" of 1842. So significant was the issue and so widespread its effect that the neighboring state of Massachusetts was drawn into the struggle. It was unavoidable that a conservative government in Massachusetts should express sympathy with the cause of conservatism in Rhode Island, but it appears that the Whig administration of 1842 went further and gave military aid. Democrats seized the opportunity to appeal to the people in behalf of free suffrage. Enough feeling was aroused to overthrow the Whig government, to return the Democrat, Morton, a second time as governor, and to put Democrats in control of the legislature of 1843.[32]

During the 'thirties and 'forties opinion in Massachusetts hostile to slavery developed to such proportions that it finally became more than a social and moral problem. It demanded the attention of political parties. As early as 1831 a rift had appeared among the Democrats. While Morton had abandoned political association with Calhoun, largely, it seems, because of irreconcilable differences over slavery, Henshaw's newspaper, the Boston *Statesman*, had assured the Southern slaveholder that Massachusetts Democrats did not approve of abolitionism.[33] Neither Whig nor Democratic organizations would sponsor Garrison and his programme of non-resistance and vituperation. The Abolitionists of Middlesex County, many of whom normally were Whigs, preferred in 1839 to give their votes to an out-and-out Democrat rather than to help elect a conservative whose opinion on the subject of antislavery did not altogether meet with their demands. It was apparent that the Whig party was not united in support of the Massachusetts cotton-manufacturer and Southern cotton-planter. By 1840 the abolitionists who repudiated Garrison's non-resistance had left their old political associations and formed the Liberty party.[34] The issue had become subversive of party discipline. When a few years later annexation of Texas and the extension of slave territory became pressing questions, both Whig and Democratic politicians found that many more were beginning to abandon their parties. Social, religious, and economic prejudices prevented old conservatives from converging into a new party. No such traditions, however, were strong enough to prevent a union of

32 A. M. Mowry, *The Dorr War* (1901); J. A. Bolles, *Affairs of Rhode Island* (1842); files of the *Bay State Democrat* and Boston *Advertiser*, 1842.

33 Morton, Letter-book, vol. I., letters to Calhoun and G. B. Perry; *Statesman*, Sept. 24, 1831.

34 Emerson, *Journals*, July 7, 1839, V. 235, 302; *The Liberator*, October–November, 1840; Massachusetts Archives.

"Young Whigs" and radical Democrats, or "Barnburners", in the new Free Soil movement. Although forced to set aside the abolitionism of the Liberty men, antislavery had broken party lines and compelled the nation to recognize the slave as a political problem.[35]

In this survey of political actions from 1824 to 1848, general tendencies may be discerned. The National Republicans, their successors the Whigs, and those descendants of the Whigs, the Native Americans, all displayed themselves as conservatives and, at times, reactionaries. They all stood for the established order and invariably were to be found on the opposing side of any issue which seemed to involve a change. In the Antimasonic, Liberty, and Free Soil parties there were elements from both conservative and democratic sources. All three at the beginning appeared to draw more support from National Republican or Whig elements, but these accessions came chiefly from rural conservative sources, or, if the term may be applied, from the liberal element in the Whig party. It is especially noteworthy that a greater number of Antimasons went back to Democratic than to conservative or Whig affiliations.

There were visible two distinct factions in the Democratic party, the conservative urban and the radical country groups. The latter was much more in sympathy with the farmers who made up the bulk of the Workingmen's party than with their fellow Democrats in the city. After the Workingmen and radical Antimasons had joined with rural Democracy, it rose to a position of domination over the whole party, and raised its candidate to the governorship in 1840 and 1843, triumphant over Whig "aristocracy".

The urban society of Boston and its suburban towns of Dorchester, Roxbury, Brighton, and Brookline apparently had interests counter to those of the country folk. In most cases this difference of feeling coincided remarkably with that between Whig and Democratic opinion, so much so that, notwithstanding the large conservative rural element in the Whig party, one might almost call the Whig party urban and the Democratic rural. In the course of twenty-five years this rivalry took many forms. It was vital in the controversy of 1827 between the property-holders of Boston and the farmers of Middlesex, in the Workingmen's movement of 1833 and 1834 against the "accumulators" in Boston society. It appeared in the war on the Bank of the United States, in which the country folk assailed the exclusive privileges of the wealthy who controlled banks and other

35 J. G. Palfrey, *The Slave Power* (1846); *Morning Post* and *Advertiser* (1847–1848); Morton, Letter-book, vol. IV., letters to Bancroft and Van Buren; Boston *Republican* (1848).

corporations; it appeared again in the protests of farmers against the urban capitalists who owned the railroads, although they had been built largely on public credit. The same jealousy made impossible throughout the twenty-five years any readjustment of representation in the legislature. For once, the country faction was reactionary. The feeling cropped out finally in the struggle over slavery at the party conventions of 1847. To the country Whigs, Charles Sumner appealed against the war with Mexico and the extension of slave territory. The country delegates to the Democratic convention demanded resolutions against the slave system. It was the union of these rural elements, Whig and Democratic, that in 1848 created the Free Soil party and pointed the way for the Republican party which was soon to express the sectional interests of the Northern states and defend them against the South in the Civil War.[36]

ARTHUR B. DARLING.

36 Valuable impressions have been gained from both the speeches and papers of Robert Rantoul, jr., and the diary of John Quincy Adams, and they have been taken into consideration although no specific point in this paper has seemed to necessitate a direct reference. As a member of the state legislature in 1836–1837 Rantoul conducted the Democratic attack upon the laws for capital punishment. He was a persistent aspirant for federal office and worker in the Democratic organization, but never a director of its policy like Henshaw or Bancroft.

NOTES AND SUGGESTIONS

The Metz Interview of May 9, 1877

The publication of the official documents of the German Foreign Office [1] has among other things brought to light the details of a curious episode in diplomatic history which is not without significance in any consideration of the history of the Third Republic. This episode concerns the interview between Kaiser Wilhelm I. and M. de Gontaut-Biron, the French ambassador to Germany, at Metz, one week prior to the Seize-Mai and the so-called attempt at personal government on the part of the French Clericals under the ministry of the Duc de Broglie. It illustrates the manner in which the Duc Decazes, the French foreign secretary, exploited the difference of opinion that existed between the Kaiser and Bismarck upon the policy to be pursued toward France and the way in which he took advantage of the excitement prevailing in diplomatic circles over the English reply to Russia of May 6, a reply which seemed to threaten an intervention in the Russo-Turkish war on the side of the Turk. It also suggests almost irresistibly that MacMahon and the Clericals would never have dared to make their attempt at personal government, an attempt that was obviously the forerunner of a monarchical restoration in France, Bismarck's bête noire,[2] had they not had the assurances of the emperor that such a move would be acceptable to him. This view is vigorously contested by Dreux, Gontaut's biographer,[3] but his protests lack weight when compared with the record revealed by the *Memoirs* of Hohenlohe and Ballhausen and by the official German documents.

Paris had been in a ferment since the fourth of May over the internal political situation, and on every side talk of a *coup d'état* was to be heard.[4] Gontaut, who was closely attached to the Clerical party, arrived in Paris the morning of the seventh and was sent that same evening by MacMahon and Decazes to "saluer l'Empereur à

1 *Die Grosse Politik der Europäischen Kabinette, 1871–1914* (Berlin, 1922, 6 vols.).

2 Hohenlohe, *Memoirs* (New York, 1906), II. 109.

3 Dreux, *Dernières Années de l'Ambassade en Allemagne de M. de Gontaut-Biron, 1874–1877* (Paris, 1907), pp. 328–331, *passim*. See also London *Times*, Jan. 23, 1878.

4 Coubertin, *Evolution of France under the Third Republic* (New York, 1897), p. 68.

Metz ", where the latter was on a tour of inspection preliminary to the proposed strengthening of the German garrisons in Alsace-Lorraine. Hohenlohe, informed to this effect by Decazes on the eighth, at once reported the fact to Bülow at the Wilhelmstrasse, advising him that Gontaut was doubtless instructed to commit the Kaiser to an assurance of peaceful intentions that could be exploited in France.[5] Bülow received this letter on the ninth and immediately telegraphed Wilhelm warning him that the interview was liable to misconstruction and hence should be limited so far as possible.[6]

However on the ninth the Kaiser received Gontaut, who returned to Paris as soon as the interview was at an end.[7] No account of the meeting appeared in the French, English, or German papers until the fourteenth, a somewhat surprising fact, although it must be remembered that the attention of Europe was concentrated on the Anglo-Russo-Turkish situation. The account published on the fourteenth consisted of an obviously inspired article in several of the Berlin journals and described the conversation as having been a friendly discussion of the proposed strengthening of the Alsatian garrisons,[8] a statement which was based on the emperor's assurances to Bülow on his return from Metz.[9] But Wilhelm did not tell Bülow the whole story.

In speaking of the English reply to Russia of May 6, then the talk of diplomatic Europe, he had been guilty of a decided indiscretion. By his own account of May 15[10] he had in substance said that it was a " réponse que nous autres éviterons de faire. . . . C'est bien à nous de chercher de maintenir l'Angleterre dans la neutralité qu'elle aussi a proclamée ". This unfortunate remark was at once utilized by Decazes to throw dust in the eyes of the diplomats pending the final preparations for the Clerical coup of May 16. He told Wimpffen, the Austro-Hungarian ambassador at Paris, that the Kaiser had said, " Je suis très mécontent de la réponse anglaise et j'espère que la France ne donnera pas dans ces intrigues anglaises ". This version reached Münster, the German ambassador at London, who telegraphed it to Bülow the fourteenth.[11] On the fifteenth Bülow received this alarming report and at once informed Bismarck, who was at Friedrichsruhe, of this indiscretion of the Kaiser's.[12] At

5 *Die Grosse Politik*, I. 316.
6 *Ibid.*, p. 316n.
7 Dreux, *op. cit.*, p. 329.
8 Quoted in *Journal des Débats*, May 16, 1877.
9 Bülow to Hohenlohe, May 14, 1877, *Die Grosse Politik*, I. 317–318.
10 *Die Grosse Politik*, I. 320, *Randmerkung*.
11 *Ibid.*, pp. 318–319n.
12 Missing from the archives. *Cf. ibid.*, p. 319n.

the same time he inquired of the latter as to whether he had actually used this exceedingly undiplomatic language and asked for an interview.[13] The emperor replied by endorsement giving the account quoted above,[14] and although, as Bülow noted, the dangerous word *Intrigen* had not been used, yet Wilhelm's remarks had been such as to lend themselves only too readily to misconstruction.[15]

Bismarck had written in reply to Bülow's report on the Münster telegram, directing him to tell the Kaiser that he (Bismarck) would resign if foreign policy was not to be wholly under his control,[16] and armed with this Bülow went on May 16 to remonstrate with the Kaiser on his use of dangerous and unconsidered expressions. The interview was not a pleasant one, and a full account of it is given in Bülow's report to Bismarck written May 17.[17]

But while the Wilhelmstrasse was pursuing this red herring which Decazes had drawn across the trail and was vainly trying to discover what the emperor had really said to Gontaut, the answer was already being given in Paris. On May 16 the French Clericals, confident in the assurances which Gontaut had brought back from Metz, took over the government of France and began their attempt at personal government. This was accomplished by MacMahon's brusque letter of May 16 dismissing the Simon ministry, by the appointment of a new cabinet under the Duc de Broglie (who was most unpopular with the republican Chamber of Deputies), and by the prorogation two days later of that body.[18] Decazes continued as foreign secretary under the new government, and Gontaut remained as ambassador to Germany.

Political feeling in Paris ran high, and the meeting of Gontaut and the Kaiser of a week previous, hitherto unnoticed in the press, was recalled. The natural deduction was made from the close conjunction of the two events, and, as it appears, the correct one. Rumors went about and even crept into some of the French journals, in spite of the strict censorship exercised by the new government.[19] Quite naturally every effort was made by all concerned to banish the idea that the Kaiser's remarks to Gontaut at Metz had any connection with the internal crisis in France. Gontaut, who had remained in

13 *Die Grosse Politik*, I. 318–320.

14 *Ibid.*, p. 320, *Randmerkung*.

15 *Ibid.*, pp. 320–322.

16 *Ibid.*, p. 319n.

17 *Ibid.*, pp. 320–322.

18 It was finally dissolved on June 26 with the consent of the Senate, which was monarchist and clerical in its sympathies. Hanotaux, *Histoire de la France Contemporaine, 1871–1900*, IV. 44–45.

19 Zevort, *Histoire de la Troisième République*, II. 340.

Paris,[20] assured Hohenlohe that there was nothing in the rumor and a denial was published in *Le Soir*.[21] The Paris correspondent of the London *Times*, who got his information from governmental circles, also published a *démenti* on May 19.[22]

But if it was easy to hide the truth from the French and English publics, it was not so easy to deceive Bismarck. The question of the emperor's utterances at Metz was fresh on his mind, he could recall that the disquieting rumors as to their purport came originally from Decazes, whom he knew of old,[23] and it seems that he had already received reports from the Rothschilds in Paris predicting the Seize-Mai.[24] On the twentieth he proceeded to Berlin and on the following day had interviews with the Kaiser and with the crown prince,[25] who was an intimate of Gontaut. There is no record of either conversation, but from his ensuing actions and later statements it is to be gathered that he then discovered the whole truth about the Metz interview.

It was as he feared. The Kaiser had been more than merely indiscreet in his remarks to Gontaut, he had actually reversed Bismarck's anti-clerical, pro-republican French policy, as may be seen from subsequent disclosures. According to Ballhausen, Bismarck told him on June 29, 1877:

> Gontaut is still . . . trying to lead his Majesty into making unconsidered remarks as he did at Metz. If the Kaiser says to him what he has written to me, then we shall see an intrigue quite to the liking of MacMahon and to the disadvantage of the Republic [*i.e.*, a Clerical *coup d'état*]. The Kaiser has told him that "comme vieux monarque" he did not sympathize with the Republic.[26]

A second bit of evidence as to the nature of the emperor's utterances at Metz is found in the report of a conversation between Wilhelm and General d'Abzac, MacMahon's aide-de-camp, which probably took place in Berlin on August 31, the day after d'Abzac's arrival there on a special mission from the marshal.[27] The Kaiser said then:

20 Dreux, *Dernières Années*, p. 273.

21 *Die Grosse Politik*, I. 323.

22 London *Times*, May 19, 1877.

23 Compare Decazes's disclosure of the German threats in 1875. See also *Die Grosse Politik*, I. 311, 319.

24 Hohenlohe, II. 204.

25 Kohl, *Bismarck-Regesten*, p. 144.

26 Ballhausen, *Bismarck-Erinnerungen*, p. 111.

27 This conversation quoted by Dreux, p. 282, is undated. But the special mission is mentioned in a letter from Decazes to Gontaut, Aug. 26, 1877: "Le Maréchal envoie le général d'Abzac en Allemagne avec ordre de voir le plus de monde possible, de beaucoup écouter et de beaucoup expliquer" (Dreux, pp. 275–276). *L'Univers* of Sept. 2, 1877, carries an item dated Aug. 31 reporting that the Kaiser had that day accorded d'Abzac a private interview.

Dites bien au maréchal de Mac-Mahon que j'ai compris et approuvé le Seize-Mai, que j'ai la certitude que j'aurai toujours avec lui les relations les meilleures, que j'ai été tout à fait touché du tact exquis qu'il a su mettre en m'envoyant Gontaut me complimenter à Metz, mission très délicate, dont nul autre que son ambassadeur auprès de moi ne pouvait être chargé. Donnez-lui, de ma part, les assurances les plus pacifiques et dites-lui que quel que soit le résultat des élections, il faut qu'il reste à son poste. Nous n'avons qu'un ennemi qui doit nous être commun: le radicalisme; nous avons le même intérêt à le combattre. Qu'il n'ait nulle inquiétude au sujet de l'envoi de troupes en Alsace-Lorraine; ce mouvement se borne à l'envoi à Metz du régiment d'infanterie actuellement stationné à Wissembourg, et plus tard à l'envoi d'une brigade de cavalerie.[28]

From the above it would seem that the Kaiser and the chancellor were not yet one on French policy. A final and conclusive statement is found in Hohenlohe's diary for September 6, 1877, which brings out in sharp detail both the nature of the Metz interview and Bismarck's differences with the emperor:

The emperor [Bismarck told Hohenlohe] made the prosecution of our French policy difficult because he always let himself be persuaded by Gontaut to lay weight on the "solidarity of conservative interests", the old Arnim policy, instead of aiming at keeping France disunited and incapable of alliances. . . . Gontaut's journey to Metz had been brought about by the empress and . . . the emperor was in a measure responsible for May 16, because he had spoken to Gontaut to the above-mentioned effect.[29]

In view of the foregoing it is difficult to doubt that the Kaiser told Gontaut on May 9 that he would welcome a monarchist and Clerical restoration in France.

Informed of this blow to his French policy, Bismarck spent a busy three days in the Wilhelmstrasse from May 21 to 24,[30] doing what was possible to minimize its consequences. On the twenty-fourth he took his departure for Kissingen.[31] On the twenty-sixth the German Foreign Office issued a circular addressed to all the German embassies in Europe, informing them of the rumors current in France to the effect that the Seize-Mai had been actuated by the Kaiser's assurances to Gontaut at Metz. This was to be denied. Hohenlohe had been instructed to have an emphatic denial published in one of the more influential journals of the French capital, which was to represent the official German view.[32] This *démenti*, sweeping

28 Dreux, p. 282.

29 Hohenlohe, II. 203–204.

30 London *Times*, May 24, 1877; *Journal des Débats*, May 24, 25, 1877.

31 Kohl, p. 144.

32 *Die Grosse Politik*, I. 322–323.

in character, came out in the *Journal des Débats* of May 27,[33] and there the matter rested.

There is no space here to consider Bismarck's attempts throughout the summer to dislodge the new French Cabinet. A press campaign was initiated in Germany attacking the Clerical régime in France,[34] and the border garrisons were ostentatiously strengthened. An unsuccessful attempt was made to have Gontaut recalled,[35] and on at least two occasions Bismarck publicly exhibited his distaste for the Broglie government.[36] Moreover Hohenlohe was instructed to use all means at his disposal in France to undermine the monarchist and Clerical ascendancy.[37]

But although the incident of the Metz interview has remained a closed matter ever since, although it has been hushed up and forgotten in the sweep of greater events, it still remains as a curious reminder of the differences of opinion between Kaiser Wilhelm I. and Bismarck, as an example of the diplomatic methods of Gontaut and Decazes, and as an element not to be overlooked in any account of French political history during the 'seventies.

Henry Carter.

The Rifle in the American Revolution

The attention of the student of the American Revolutionary War is constantly drawn to the rifle as a military arm. In fact, one of the first acts of the Continental Congress, in 1775, was to call for companies of "expert riflemen", and these companies were the beginning of the Continental Army.[1]

The American rifleman was picturesque in his round hat and hunting shirt, and his marksmanship compelled British officers and sergeants to lay aside their spontoons and halberds while on American service[2]—just as later, in South Africa, British officers abandoned their swords, and for the same reason. That he made excellent use of his weapon we are assured in many contemporaneous sources. One German officer characterized the rifleman as "terrible".[3] An-

33 Incorrectly cited as May 28 in *Die Grosse Politik*, I. 323n.

34 Dreux, p. 273.

35 *Die Grosse Politik*, I. 324–325, 325–326n.

36 Dreux, pp. 332–333, 275–277.

37 *Die Grosse Politik*, I. 325–327.

1 *Journals of Congress*, I. 82.

2 Hamilton, *History of the Grenadier Guards* (London, 1874). Stevens, *Gen. Howe's Orderly Book* (London, 1890), p. 210.

3 *Letters of Brunswick and Hessian Officers* (trans. Stone, Albany, 1891), p. 90.

other wrote that the best American riflemen could, in a good light and with no wind, hit a man's head at 200 yards and his body at 300.[4] We are told that the riflemen, when they joined the army near Boston in August, 1775, gave an exhibition, in which a company, on a quick advance, placed their shots in seven-inch targets at 250 yards.[5]

Some very accurate shooting is described in the *Virginia Gazette* of September 9, 1775. Riflemen, bound for Boston, gave an exhibition. A man held between his knees a board five inches wide and seven inches long, with a paper bull's-eye the size of a dollar. A rifleman at sixty yards, without a rest, put eight bullets in succession through the bull's-eye.[6]

The rifle had been introduced into America about 1700, when there was considerable immigration into Pennsylvania from Switzerland and that vicinity, the only part of the world at that time where it was in use. It was then short, heavy, clumsy, and little more accurate than the musket. But in America the gunsmiths made remarkable improvements, and by 1750 it had evolved into a long, slender, small-bore gun, with a calibre about .50 and taking balls of about 36 to the pound—a weapon of accuracy.[7] It was little known in New England, and it may be said to have been confined to Pennsylvania and the colonies south, particularly to the western or border regions.[8]

The standard military firearm of the period was the flint-lock musket, weighing about eleven pounds and measuring four feet nine inches without bayonet. Its calibre was about .75, or eleven gauge—that is, it would take a lead ball of eleven to the pound.[9] When fired horizontally from the shoulder it had a range of about 125 yards. At 100 yards, a good marksman might make 40 per cent. of hits on a target the size of a man standing.[10]

The question naturally arises, why did the musket continue to be the standard firearm when the rifle was available? Why was a weapon that had not sufficient accuracy to give a reasonable number of hits on a man standing at 100 yards preferred to one that could at that range deliver a high percentage of hits on a target the size of a man's head?

4 Kephart, "Birth of the American Army", in *Penn. German Magazine*, VIII. 373.

5 Thacher, *Military Journal* (Boston, 1827), p. 33.

6 Moore, *Diary of the American Revolution* (Philadelphia, 1860), p. 121.

7 Sawyer, *Firearms in American History* (Boston, 1910), II. 32–38. Fremantle, *The Book of the Rifle* (London, 1901), pp. 11, 28–30.

8 Sawyer, II. 80.

9 Greener, *The Gun and its Development* (London, 1881), p. 106.

10 Sawyer, II. 102.

The rifle was much slower than the musket, about three to one.[11] This was due to its laborious loading process. The bullet had to fit very tightly, to take the rifling, and so was forced in with an iron rod about six inches long and a wooden mallet, then driven home with the ramrod. When the piece was foul the process was especially slow. The musket, on the other hand, could be quickly loaded with a loosely fitting ball or balls. Another important difference was that the musket, being a standard military arm, was fitted with a bayonet, while the slender rifle barrel, unstandardized, had received no such attachment.

The musket and rifle were thus quite distinct weapons. The musket and bayonet were the weapons for the line of battle, where the target was not an individual but another line, and when the lines closed the bayonet was ready for use. Firearms were very sensitive to the weather; after long-continued or heavy rain they were useless, and lack of a bayonet was then fatal. To take advantage of the power of the rifle, fire must be opened at a longer range, and its accuracy utilized in aiming at individuals. It could not be used with the musket in the line of battle, for the smoke then prevented the rifleman from seeing his target, thus nullifying the principal advantage of the weapon.

Its slow loading and lack of a bayonet made the rifle weak against the advance of a determined enemy, so this weapon was best adapted to the light troops, which acted outside of the line of battle. Firing from positions in woods and on rough ground, difficult for the rigid line of the period, they could retreat when pressed and avoid a hand-to-hand engagement. The qualities of the musket and rifle were such that they could not be used together, but they could, in the hands of separate bodies, be combined to their mutual advantage. This idea was expressed by an American military writer in 1811, who said that "where the musket ends, the rifle begins". He also noted that a rifle corps is distinct from any other species of troops and useless in close combat.[12]

At the beginning of the Revolution, England had no riflemen, and so called for *Jäger* in her German contingents. These were trained riflemen, recruited from hunters and gamekeepers. They wore a distinctive green uniform, and their orders in action were given on the hunting horn, instead of the drum, as in the line infantry. Among the Brunswickers serving with Burgoyne under General

11 Fremantle, p. 24.

12 Hoyt, *Practical Instructions for Military Officers* (Greenfield, Mass., 1811), p. 111.

Riedesel, there was a battalion of *Jäger*, over 650 strong.[13] The Hessians had one *Jäger* company with the contingent that arrived with de Heister in August, 1776, and another arrived with Knyphausen in October. These two companies proved so useful that more were called for, and the Landgrave furnished five companies, one of them mounted, about a thousand rifles in all. Other companies came from Hanau and Anspach.[14]

The *Jäger* rifle was by no means the equal of the American. It was short-barrelled, and took a ball of nineteen to the pound. The fixed sights were set for 100 yards. With its large ball and a small powder charge, this rifle was of low velocity, high trajectory, strong recoil, limited accurate range, and slow fire. It was the same gun that had been introduced into America in 1700. It had no bayonet.[15]

In 1776 Captain Patrick Ferguson, of the British 70th Foot, invented a breech-loading rifle, which could fire four aimed shots per minute.[16] In 1777 he was sent to America with one hundred officers and men, armed with the new rifle and uniformed in the rifleman's green.[17] With him came special instructions, authorizing him to select men from the various regiments. General Howe was at this time the chief authority on light infantry, and this request seems to have annoyed him. But the corps was formed, and went into action for the first time at Elk Head, August 25, 1777; and it covered the advance of Knyphausen's division at the battle of Brandywine, where the value of the breech-loader was proved in a striking manner. Ferguson operated alongside the Queen's Rangers, a Loyalist light corps; but his men did not have to expose themselves in loading, and so lost only two men, while the Rangers lost seventeen. Ferguson's corps soon disappeared, being incorporated into the light companies of the various battalions. Ferguson was promoted to major in 1779, and, with the temporary rank of lieutenant-colonel, was put in command of the "American Volunteers", a corps of Loyalists from New York and New Jersey, armed with the Ferguson rifle. This corps accompanied Clinton to Charleston and took part in the battle of King's Mountain, where Ferguson met his end.[18]

The best known corps raised by the British among the Loyalists, such as Tarleton's Legion and Simcoe's Queen's Rangers, were not

13 *Journal of DuRoy the Elder* (Univ. of Pa. Press, 1911), p. 1.

14 Lowell, *The Hessians and other German Auxiliaries* (New York, 1884), p. 107.

15 Sawyer, III. 26, 28.

16 *Id.*, II. 138.

17 *American MSS. in the Royal Institution*, I. 93.

18 Wilkins, *Some British Soldiers in America* (London, 1914), p. 152.

armed with the rifle. Simcoe, in his *Journal,* states that the riflemen in Virginia under Lafayette had no bayonets, which "permitted their opponents to take liberties with them".[19]

Probably the most famous corps of riflemen in the Continental service was Morgan's regiment, organized in June, 1777, from picked men of the entire army. This regiment served until July, 1778, when it was disbanded.[20] Corps like those of Marion, Sumter, and Pickens were probably armed with the rifle, as this weapon was most suited to partizan warfare. The French brought no riflemen to America.

It seems that, while the American rifleman was a most efficient soldier individually, and while rifle corps were of the highest value, nevertheless the characteristics of their arm confined their activities to a secondary place.

On October 26, 1776, the secretary of the Board of War wrote to the Committee of Public Safety of Maryland with reference to raising a rifle company. He said that the company would be much more serviceable if armed with muskets, as "there is a superabundance of riflemen in the army. Were it in the power of Congress to supply muskets, they would speedily reduce the number of rifles, and replace them with the former, as they are more easily kept in order, can be fired oftener, and have the advantage of bayonets".[21]

In 1777 General Wayne wrote to the Board of War that he was determined to have all his old rifles exchanged for muskets and bayonets, as experience had taught that the rifles were not fit for the field; he wished to keep only a few rifles, for issue to real marksmen. In 1778 he wrote again:

> I don't like rifles—I would almost as soon face an Enemy with a good Musket and Bayonet without amunition—as with amunition without a Bayonet; for altho' there are not many instances of bloody bayonets yet I am Confident that one bayonet keeps off an Other. . . . The enemy knowing the Defenseless State of our Riflemen rush on—they fly—mix with or pass thro' the Other Troops and communicate fears that is ever Incident to a retiring Corps—this Would not be the Case if the Riflemen had bayonets—but it would be still better if good muskets and bayonets were put into the hands of good Marksmen and Rifles entirely laid aside. For my own part, I never wish to see one—at least without a bayonet.[22]

In 1808 General Graham of North Carolina, writing of the southern campaigns of the Revolutionary War, said that it was unfortunate

19 Simcoe, *Journal of the Operations of the Queen's Rangers* (Exeter, 1787), pp. 2, 167.

20 Graham, *Life of Morgan* (New York, 1856), pp. 123, 215.

21 Force, *American Archives,* fifth ser., II. 1247.

22 Stillé, *Maj.-Gen. Anthony Wayne,* p. 118.

that there were no other kind of militia there than riflemen. He quoted Daniel Morgan, the great rifleman, as having said to him, referring to the campaign of 1777 in New York: "My riflemen would have been of little service if they had not always had a line of Musquet and Bayonette men to support us; it is this that gives them confidence. They know, if the enemy charges them they have a place to retreat to and are not beat clear off." [23]

On August 17, 1777, Henry Laurens wrote to Colonel William Thompson, commenting favorably upon the latter's request for authority to replace half his rifles with muskets and bayonets. It seems to have been the colonel's intention to have rifle companies in the regiment which he could use for skirmishing, thus combining in one regiment the two species of troops—light (rifles) and line (musketmen).[24] General Stephen, on October 17, 1776, thought it would be decidedly for the good of the service to replace the rifles of the 4th Virginia with muskets and bayonets;[25] and Colonel McIntosh, while organizing the 1st Continental Battalion of Georgia in February, 1776, reported apologetically that he had been compelled to arm one of the eight companies with rifles because muskets were not available.[26]

General Peter Muhlenberg shows us that for general serviceability the rifle was inferior to the musket. He wrote to Washington from Winchester, February 23, 1777, as follows: "I must trouble your Excellency with another petition in behalf of my regiment. The whole regiment consists at present of riflemen; and the campaign we have made to the southward last summer fully convinced me that on a march, where soldiers are without tents, and their arms continually exposed to the weather, rifles are of little use. I would therefore request your Excellency to convert my regiment into musketry." Finally, the opinion of the commander-in-chief is expressed in his reply to Muhlenberg, in which the staff officer writing in the name of Washington says: "His Excellency, satisfied with the justice of your observation about rifles, has determined to have as few used as possible. He will put muskets into the hands of all those battalions that are not very well acquainted with rifles." [27]

The inherent weakness of the rifle appears from the above quotations. Too slow in loading, and without a bayonet, the rifleman

23 W. A. Graham, *Gen. Joseph Graham and his Papers* (Raleigh, 1904), p. 135.

24 Burnett, *Letters of Members of the Continental Congress* (Washington, 1923), II. 452.

25 Force, *American Archives*, fifth ser., II. 1092.

26 *Id.*, fourth ser., IV. 1159–1160.

27 H. A. Muhlenberg, *Life of Maj.-Gen. Peter Muhlenberg* (Philadelphia, 1849), pp. 74, 354.

could not meet a charge. His service was restricted to rough country, with a line of retreat always open. It also appears that the Americans had more riflemen than they could use. They required more men so armed and trained that they could meet the British soldier on an equality.

JOHN W. WRIGHT,
Colonel U. S. Infantry.

THE HISTORY INQUIRY

AN inquiry into the present content, organization, and tendencies of history teaching in our schools is being made at the request of the American Historical Association's Committee on History in the Schools. The work is in charge of Professor Edgar Dawson of Hunter College, secretary of the National Council for the Social Studies, under an appointment made in the Division of School Experimentation of the Institute of Educational Research, Teachers College, Columbia University. It will be supervised by a committee appointed under the authority of the officers of the American Historical Association. The Institute of Educational Research will contribute to the investigation expert advice on the conduct of such an investigation and financial aid in getting the work done; but the character of the information to be collected and the organization of it for publication will be in the hands of the committee of historical scholars of which Professor W. E. Lingelbach of the University of Pennsylvania is chairman.

The immediate purpose of the investigation is to furnish to the American Historical Association such definite information as will guide it in determining the policy of the Association in dealing with its obligation to history teaching in the schools. For this purpose the information was needed before the end of December, 1923, and the work of collecting it has been vigorously pushed. But some time after the beginning of the new year will be used in the final formulation of such a report as will be interesting and valuable to all who are engaged in educational administration. Both the investigation and the report will be limited to objective information collected in a scientific spirit for the use of those who are in need of facts in this field. No effort will be made to argue the desirability of one course or method as compared with another. This argument and the formulation of courses of study will be left to those who are to use the facts after the work of investigation is terminated. Those who are interested in the undertaking are invited to send information, suggestions, or inquiries to Mr. Dawson, 425 West 123d Street, New York City.

For those who have laid emphasis on the need of information in this field, this inquiry offers an opportunity which should be fully used. An inquiry into the status of history in the schools must necessarily consider, to some extent at least, the status of the other social studies as well. If there are teachers or school administrators who wish to know what is being done in this field, now is the time to send in their requests for definite information in order that it may be secured and supplied to them. While the fullest discussion of the inquiry is solicited, those who are too busy to do more than send to the above address a brief statement of the lines along which investigation should be made are urged to do that at the earliest possible moment.

What facts are needed by those who must answer any of the following questions: Is American history required of most high school graduates? Do most graduates of the schools understand something of the development of our constitution? Do most of them understand the development of our present social problems? How many of them have studied enough of European history to appreciate the relation of European affairs to our own? Is it possible, in the opinion of experienced school men, to accomplish useful results in this direction through a one-year survey of general history? Are the college entrance requirements in history working to the detriment of the general education of those who do not go to college? Is too much time being given to current events? Is the history of those parts of America lying outside of the United States given enough attention by history teachers? Are the objectives or purposes of history teaching clear enough in the minds of those who are teaching it? Is the mere memorizing of dates and names still a fault of history teaching in many places? What are the leading tendencies in the development of history curricula?

If these or similar questions are confronting teachers or administrators of the social studies, an opportunity is at hand to procure answers to them, but some of the problems are likely to be overlooked in the search for facts unless those who are confronted by the problems will lay them early before those conducting the inquiry. It is hoped that those who are interested will act promptly.

EDGAR DAWSON,
425 West 123d Street, New York City.

DOCUMENTS

Papers of Count Tisza, 1914–1918

[For the following documents, we are indebted to Professor Henrik Marczali, an eminent professor of history in the University of Budapest. It will be remembered that Count Tisza, prime minister of Hungary from 1913 to 1917, was assassinated on October 31, 1918. Professor Fay, in one of the articles on "The Origins of the War" which he contributed to this journal, lamented (*American Historical Review*, XXV. 619) our lack of such statements as Count Tisza might have given us if he had survived the war. The lack may be thought to be in some measure supplied by the following documents. It has for many years been the practice of Professor Marczali to seek conversations with the public men of Hungary respecting their public actions. The first six paragraphs of the introductory statement signed by him (no. I., below) may be considered as based on such a conversation with Count Tisza. A more direct authority attaches to the documents below numbered II. and III., which Professor Marczali has been duly authorized by Count Tisza's family to publish. No. II. is a memorandum which Count Tisza sent to the emperor-king in March, 1914, and which Professor Marczali was permitted to copy in January, 1918. The German text is accompanied by a translation by Miss Frances G. Davenport. The original of no. III., of which a photostat has been sent to the editor, is written in Magyar, not here reproduced. It is presented in a translation prepared by Mr. Wilfred Stevens, translator to the Department of State in Washington. Its origin is indicated in Professor Marczali's preliminary statement. He had sent to Count Tisza a memorandum of what the latter had said to him, in a conversation in January, 1918. The count returned it without correction, but with such comments as are to be found in no. III., below. At the request of the editor, Professor Fay has been so good as to examine the papers and to make the comments which are appended, respecting their bearing upon the questions which he has done so much to elucidate.

One result, however, of submitting the documents to Professor Fay has been to receive information from him that document no. II., Count Tisza's memorandum of March 15, 1914, has already been printed, from the original in the former imperial archives at Vienna, by Dr. Wilhelm Fraknói, in his pamphlet entitled *Die Ungarische*

Regierung und die Entstehung des Weltkrieges (Vienna, Seidel, 1919), pp. 7–13. In spite of this late and somewhat disconcerting discovery, the editor thinks it best to print the document as planned, since few American readers will have seen the pamphlet, and to many the English version will be welcome. Ed.]

I.

Count Stephen Tisza (born 1861) was nominated president of the Hungarian government on June 15, 1913. He was treated by the Emperor and King Francis Joseph with the same favor as in the time of his first premiership (1903–1905).

The outbreak of the Second Balkan War, the turning of its former allies and of Rumania against Bulgaria, gave him the first occasion to expound his views on foreign affairs. He thought the alliance with Bulgaria necessary, partly to secure the connection with Turkey, partly because of Rumania. There were two possible courses respecting this state, where public opinion was already strong against us: either to keep it in the alliance, or, in case of desertion, to hold it on both sides. If Rumania should remain loyal, its territorial integrity would be fully guaranteed.

The carrying out of these views met with great obstacles. Both the Emperor William II. and the Archduke Francis Ferdinand had a great sympathy for Rumania and an equal antipathy for King Ferdinand of Bulgaria. It was not until the visit of the Emperor William in Vienna (October 26–27, 1913) that Count Berchtold and Count Tisza could persuade him to change his opinion. He did it so quickly that the two ministers did not believe his new conviction to be durable; but on his visit to Konopischt, the Emperor treated already on this basis with the Archduke.

The event of Serajevo, which followed so quickly upon this visit, prevented the carrying out of this policy and neither the Rumanian nor the Bulgarian question was settled, when the war broke out.

The Hungarian law XII., 1867, containing the compromise with Austria, decrees that the foreign affairs of the monarchy belong to the common minister, who has to conduct them in accord with the governments of both Austria and Hungary, and with the consent of both. This legal right was used by Count Julius Andrássy in 1870 to avoid taking part in the Franco-German war, and by Count Stephen Tisza in 1916 to avoid a general conflagration or at least to localize it.

The Balkan wars of 1912-1913 had strengthened Serbia, had made Russia the arbiter of this peninsula, and as a consequence, had severely injured the prestige of the Habsburg monarchy. Count Berchtold, the common minister of foreign affairs, was ready to adopt forcible measures but was restrained by the veto of both the allies, by Italy and by Germany. Russian influence grew stronger and the provocations, not only by Serbia, but by "allied" Rumania too, made the situation still more critical.

In this plight Count Tisza wrote, in March, 1914, the following memorial (II.), which I copied on January 18, 1918. It may be remarked that the Hungarian premier desires a "politique de longue main", and repeatedly mentions "an evolution agreeable for us", "a work of several years of keeping peace". No idea, of what happened some months after.

When, after having discussed the status of foreign affairs before the war, I asked Count Tisza what was his behavior after Serajevo, I was cause and witness of a memorable scene. Tisza rose and with a voice full of emotion, said: "My whole being revolted against the horror of war. Religion and patriotism alike commanded me to avert this infernal trial from humanity and our country. I was sure, that if the conflagration began here, it would spread all over the world, and I did everything to hinder its outburst." That man, so devoid of pose, was quite beside himself; we—the Countess was present—saw him violently moved. When he told what he had done to avoid war, I asked him to write it all for me, as these were words so momentous that not a jot should be altered.

That is the origin of his letter (III.).

As soon as he had finished, I asked, I pressed him, to allow me to publish the facts. He resolutely refused, though the Countess also insisted. He did not state the reason for his refusal, but to me it was evident. If not he, others would be responsible. To leave the matter in that shape was incompatible with his character. The only concession he made was, that he would, in due time, ask the king's permission for publishing the documents. He announced this intention in Parliament on October 23, 1918; it was late, far too late.

One more recollection, of an earlier interview. On September 10, 1916, I went to Tisza to convey to him intelligence about the war-terms of the Entente—intelligence which I had received from a good source. The dissolution of Austria, the dismemberment of Hungary, were already parts of the plan. When I had laid before him everything I knew, he answered: "Will they have the power to carry it out?"

I mentioned to him my conviction that, if England should be in danger, President Wilson would draw America also into the war against us. He bit his lips. "That would be too much." Afterwards we talked similarly of home affairs. When I was leaving, he detained me, asking if all I told him was serious. My answer was: "If I go to a man like you, so full of work and sorrow, I certainly speak in good earnest. I may be mistaken, but what I have said, I have said very seriously." He—taking my hand: "Forgive me, but I am indeed so full of work and sorrow, that I am almost paralyzed."

H. Marczali.

Budapest, May 10, 1923.

II.

Die Auswärtige Lage.

Die grossen Ereignisse des Vorjahres haben an unserer Ost- und Südgrenze eine Situation geschaffen, welche Besonnenheit, kaltes Blut und ruhiges, aber konsequentes und zähes Vorgehen von unserer Seite erheischt. Der Bukarester Frieden hat einen ganz unbefriedigenden Zustand geschaffen, ohne dessen Berichtigung kein wirklicher, dauernde Frieden möglich ist. Andererseits aber ist die allgemeine Erschöpfung, sowie die störende Nachwirkung in den Geistern und Gemütern zu gross, um irgendwelche erspriessliche Aktion für die nächste Zukunft zu erlauben.

Gegensätze und Leidenschaften verlegen den Weg der sachlich richtigen Beurteilung eigener und fremder Interessen. Die Selbstüberhebung

des Siegers trübt das richtige Urteil ebensosehr, wie die Erbitterung des Besiegten. Speziell unsere Monarchie kann auf die richtige Einschätzung ihres Wertes und auf eine entsprechende Würdigung ihrer Interessen und ihres Rates seitens der Balkanstaaten so lange nicht rechnen, bis der Rausch nicht vergangen und die kühle Vernunft nicht Oberhand gewonnen hat. Es wäre ein arger Fehler die Sache überstürzen und eine Entwickelung vorzeitig erzwingen zu wollen, welche nur das Ergebnis der Zeit und die Folge unserer selbstbewussten, aber ruhigen Haltung und geduldigen aber zielbewussten Politik sein kann.

Ferne ist von mir einer Politik der apathischen Resignation oder des passiven Abwartens das Wort zu reden. Im Gegentheil, man muss die Ziele klar ausstecken, unentwegt auf dieselben lossteuern, den Erfolg ruhig und sorgfältig vorbereiten. Wir brauchen eine weit vorausblickende *politique de longue main,* welche die Gegensätze ebnet, die Hindernisse aus dem Wege schafft und eine uns genehme Gruppirung der Kräfte in Südosteuropa zuwege bringt.

Zu diesem Zwecke müssen wir aber nicht nur mit unsern eigenen Absichten, sondern auch mit Deutschland ins reine kommen. Unsere Aufgabe ist an und für sich schwierig, von einem Erfolg kann keine Rede sein, wenn wir nicht die volle Gewähr haben, von Deutschland verstanden, gewürdigt und unterstützt zu werden. Deutschland muss einsehen, dass der Balkan nicht nur für uns, sondern auch für das Deutsche Reich von entscheidender Wichtigkeit ist.

Die Haltung Russlands ist wahrhaft darnach angetan, jeden diesbezüglichen Zweifel zu zerstören. Das jetzige Säbelrasseln dürfte keine momentanen kriegerischen Absichten zur Ursache haben; aber diese aggressive Stellungnahme des russischen Reiches ist geeignet, seine Kriegslust und Kriegsbereitschaft vor den Balkanvölkern zu bezeugen. In dieser Hinsicht kommt der russischen Politik die rumänische und serbische Grössenwahn ebenso zur Hilfe, wie die gefährdete Stellung Bulgariens.

Unzweifelhaft hat sich dieser Staat durch die eigene wahnsinnige Politik und durch das Nichtbefolgen unserer Ratschläge in diese verzweifelte Lage gebracht. Nichtsdestoweniger steht es fest, dass es von den Klammern der rumänischen, serbischen und griechischen Entente umfasst, und von der türkischen Regierung beunruhigt, sich in die Arme Russlands werfen muss, wenn wir nicht in die Lage kommen, ihm sichern Rückhalt zu geben. Eine Kombination, welche Bulgarien mit den übrigen christlichen Staaten unter russische Patronanz versöhnt und als Folge eines gegen die Monarchie gerichteten beglücklichen Eroberungskrieges, Mazedonien an Bulgarien zusichert, würde den uns umgehenden eisernen Ring, an dem Russland so zäh und selbstbewusst arbeitet, fertigschmieden und die militärische Ueberlegenheit der Entente auf dem Kontinent verwirklichen. Damit wäre der langersehnte Moment gekommen, wo Russland und Frankreich den Weltkrieg mit Aussicht auf Erfolg anfachen und Deutschland mit überlegenen Kräften angreifen könnten.

Deutschlands zwei Nachbarn werden die militärischen Vorbereitungen sorgfältig fortsetzen, den Krieg jedoch so lange nicht anfangen, bis sie nicht eine gegen uns gerichtete Gruppierung der Balkanvölker erreicht haben, welche die Monarchie einem Angriff von drei Seiten aussetzt und den grössten Teil unserer Streitkräfte an unserer Ost- und Südgrenze bindet. Der Schwerpunkt der europäischen Politik liegt also auch vom deutschen Standpunkt auf dem Balkan, und es ist ebensogut ein deutsches

wie ein österreichisch-ungarisches Lebensinteresse, der zielbewussten und auf Frankreich gestützten Balkanpolitik eine ebenso zielbewusste, harmonische, deutsch-österreichisch-ungarische Politik entgegenzustellen.

Es wäre höchste Zeit, unsere Absichten Rumänien, Bulgarien, der Türkei und Griechenland gegenüber, mit denjenigen Deutschlands in Einklang zu bringen. Nur unser festes Zusammengehen mit Deutschland kann unsere Beziehungen zu Rumänien wieder befestigen. Für dieses Land bleibt die Eroberung Siebenbürgens stets der grösste Köder, ein Gross-Rumänien bis zur Theiss der schönste Traum rumänischer Chauvinisten. Es gehört Selbstbeherrschung und starke, nüchterne Urteilskraft dazu, um diesem Phantasiegebilde zu entsagen, in einem Bündniss mit uns den jetzigen Besitzstand und die wahre Unabhängigkeit zu sichern und die Gefahr russischen Protektorats abzuwehren.

In den ersten Monaten des Vorjahres hat sich Rumänien in seinen Erwartungen getäuscht gesehen und glaubte von uns vernachlässigt und im Stiche gelassen zu sein. Plötzlich folgte dann der glänzende, nach der allgemeinen dortigen Meinung gegen unsern Willen erfochtene Erfolg. Der Kamm wuchs ihnen gross; ihr Unwille äusserte sich keck; die russische Intrigue schien freie Bahn bekommen zu haben.

Die bessere Ueberzeugung, dass eine gewisse Modifikation des jetzigen Zustandes zu gunsten Bulgariens für den dauernden Frieden auf den Balkan unbedingt notwendig und für die Interessen Rumäniens ungefährlich sei, kann überhaupt nur dann Raum greifen, wenn dieselbe von unserer und der deutschen Diplomatie mit Sorgfalt vorbereitet und im gegebenen Momente mit Nachdruck vertreten wird.

Es ist dies die einzige Möglichkeit Bulgarien dauernd in unserer Gravitationssphäre zu erhalten. Für Bulgarien ist eine Ausdehnung in Mazedonien eine Lebensfrage. Kann es dies im Bunde mit uns nicht erreichen, so wird es sich unbedingt Russland in die Arme werfen und die gegen uns gerichtete Eroberungspolitik unterstützen.

Der Dreibund könnte keinen verhängnissvolleren Fehler machen, als Bulgarien von sich zu stossen. Der richtige Sinn für die eigenen Interessen sollte Deutschland bewegen, uns in eine woldurchdachten bulgarophilen Politik zu unterstützen.

Die erste Aufgabe dieses hartgeprüften Landes wäre freilich, die Kräfte zu sammeln, und die eigenen Wunden zu heilen. Es ist dies eine Arbeit mehrerer Jahren, während dessen ein jeder aggressive Schritt frevelhafter Leichtsinn wäre. Einstweilen kann die bulgarische Diplomatie keinen andern Zweck verfolgen, als den Frieden aufrecht zu erhalten und mit unserer und Deutschlands Hilfe bessere Beziehungen mit Rumänien einzuleiten. Diese Politik kann jedoch durch die Ereignisse in Konstantinopel gestört werden. Wir müssen daher bedacht sein, diese Gefahr von Bulgarien und vom europäischen Frieden abzuwenden; womöglich gute, intime Beziehungen zwischen Sofia und Konstantinopel auf friedlicher Basis zuwege zu bringen.

Sollte die Türkei versuchen, Bulgarien zu überrumpeln und in einen Konflikt mit Griechenland mit sich zu reissen, so müssten wir eine Verständigung zwischen Athen und Sofia anbahnen und die zwei Länder in gemeinsamer Verteidigung gegen den türkischen Angriff verbinden. Unsere Auseinandersetzung mit Deutschland müsste also in Bezug auf Bulgarien die Folge haben, dass Deutschland ein freundliches Vorgehen Bulgarien gegenüber bekundet, unsere friedlichen Ratschläge dort unterstützt, einer Kombination für die fernere Zukunft in Bukarest die

Wege ebnet, laut welcher in einem gegebenen Moment, jedenfalls aber in einer relativ fernen Zukunft, Bulgarien sich in Mazedonien entschädigen könne, ohne hiefür von Rumänien angegriffen zu werden, und schliesslich in Konstantinopel und in Athen seinen Einfluss einsetzt, um zu verhüten, dass ein eventueller türkisch-griechischer Konflikt verhängnissvolle Folgen für Bulgarien haben könne.

Dies wäre wohl der komplizierteste und heikelste Punkt unserer vereinten Aktion mit Deutschland. Wir müssen aber diese Basis zu einer einheitlichen Aktion finden, wenn wir dem planmässigen Vorgehen der Ententemächte gegenüber einer ganz sicheren Niederlage entgehen wollen. Wäre Deutschland nicht zu bewegen, eine Bulgarien freundliche Politik in diesen bescheidenen Bahnen mitzumachen, so wäre dies allerdings auch vom Standpunkt der deutschen Interessen ein Fehler. Wir müssten uns jedoch damit abfinden, und eine Verbindung mit Rumänien und Griechenland gegen Serbien und eventuell Bulgarien ins Auge fassen. Es wäre dann die Loslösung Rumäniens und Griechenland von Serbien die wesentliche Aufgabe, und es müsste sich Deutschland mit ganzem Nachdruck in diesem Sinne einsetzen.

Was Griechenland betrifft, so haben wir jeden Grund auch unsrerseits eine freundliche Stellung diesem Lande gegenüber einzunehmen. Es fiele uns leicht unsere Haltung in Athen in Einklang mit der Haltung Deutschlands zu bringen. Es müsste nur auf eine allmähliche Lösung der griechisch-serbischen Beziehungen mit vereinter Kraft hingearbeitet werden.

Wir müssen demnach vor allem die eigenen Kräfte sammeln und durch selbstbewusstes, ruhiges Verhalten imponiren und Vertrauen einflössen.

Am Balkan müssen wir vorerst den Frieden wahren und eine uns genehme Entwickelung vorbereiten. Die Ziele unserer Balkanpolitik müssen wir vereint mit Deutschland festsetzen und auf eine uns genehme Gruppirung der Balkanstaaten hinarbeiten, wobei eine Loslösung Rumäniens und Griechenlands von Serbien die erste Aufgabe bilden würde und auf eine Versöhnung jener zwei Staaten mit Bulgarien, auf Basis einer natürlichen Vergrösserung Bulgariens auf Kosten Serbiens hinzuarbeiten wäre.

Dieses Vorgehen müsste Hand in Hand mit einer Politik in Konstantinopel gehen, welche die Türken von jedem europäischen Abenteuer zurückhält und ihnen ihren asiatischen Besitz zu sichern trachtet. Kommt es dann zu einer Konflagration, so wird die Türkei gewiss in antislavischen Lager zu finden sein.

Es ist keine Zeit zu verlieren. Alle, die für die Orientirung der österreichisch-ungarischen oder der deutschen Politik mitzutragen haben, laden die schwerste Verantwortung auf uns, wenn wir ein planmässiges, zielbewusstes, einmütiges Vorgehen nicht rechtzeitig in Angriff nehmen.

Gr. Stefan Tisza.

Budapest 15 März 1914

Masoltam 1918. jan. 18. an.

(TRANSLATION.)

The Foreign Situation.

The great events of the last year have created a situation on our eastern and southern borders that requires on our part cool and calm

consideration, but also consistent and tenacious action. The peace of Bucharest has brought about an entirely unsatisfactory condition, without the rectification of which no real, lasting peace is possible. On the other hand, the general exhaustion, as well as the disturbing after-effects upon minds and hearts, are too great to permit useful action in the immediate future.

Antagonisms and passions block the way to an objectively accurate judgment of our own and of foreign interests. The self-conceit of the victor is quite as much of a hindrance to correct judgment, as the exasperation of the conquered. Our monarchy in particular cannot count on a right valuation of its importance, and on a corresponding appreciation of its interests and of its counsel on the part of the Balkan states, until frenzy has passed and cool reason has gained the upper hand. It would be a bad mistake to wish to hurry matters and prematurely force a development that can only be the result of time and the consequence of our self-confident but calm behavior, and patient but clear-sighted policy.

Far is it from me to advocate a policy of apathetic resignation, or of passive waiting. On the contrary, we must define our purpose clearly, make for it unswervingly, prepare for the outcome quietly and carefully. We need a comprehensive, forward-looking *politique de longue main*, that smooths away obstacles, removes hindrances, and causes a grouping, favorable to us, of the powers in southeastern Europe.

For this purpose we must, however, not only determine our own aims, but come to an agreement with Germany. Our task is difficult, in and of itself, and success cannot be thought of unless we have full guaranty of being understood, appreciated, and supported by Germany. Germany must perceive that the Balkans are of decisive importance, not only for us, but also for the German Empire.

The position of Russia is indeed very likely to dissipate every doubt on that score. The present sabre-rattling may not be caused by any immediate warlike intentions; but this aggressive attitude of the Russian empire is calculated to prove its desire for war, and preparedness for war, in the eyes of the Balkan peoples. In this respect the mad ambition of Rumania and Serbia assists Russian policy quite as much as does the endangered position of Bulgaria.

Undoubtedly that state has brought itself into this desperate situation by its own insane policy, and by failure to follow our advice. Nevertheless it is certain that, held by the clamps of the Rumanian, Serbian, and Grecian entente, and harassed by the Turkish government, Bulgaria must throw herself into the arms of Russia if we do not put ourselves in a position to give her secure backing. A combination that would reconcile Bulgaria with the rest of the Christian states under Russian patronage, and as the result of a successful war of conquest directed against our Monarchy, would assure Macedonia to Bulgaria, would complete the forging of the iron ring about us, for which Russia is so tenaciously and so consciously working, and make actual the military preponderance of the Entente on the Continent. Thereby the long-desired moment would arrive when Russia and France could foment the world war with prospect of success, and attack Germany with superior forces.

Germany's two neighbors will carefully continue military preparations, but will not begin the war until they have secured a grouping of the Balkan powers directed against us, which exposes the Monarchy to an attack

from three sides and holds the greatest part of our military forces to our eastern and southern frontiers. Equally from the German point of view, therefore, the centre of gravity of European politics lies in the Balkans, and it is just as much a matter of vital concern to Germany as to Austria-Hungary to oppose to the clear-sighted Balkan policy, resting on France, an equally clear-sighted, harmonious, German-Austrian-Hungarian policy.

It is a matter of immediate necessity, to bring our plans with regard to Rumania, Bulgaria, Turkey, and Greece into accord with those of Germany. Only our firm co-operation with Germany can again secure our relations to Rumania. For that country, the conquest of Transylvania always remains the greatest lure, a Great Rumania extending to the Theiss the most beautiful dream of Rumanian chauvinists. It requires self-control, and strong, sober discernment as well, to renounce this fanciful picture and in an alliance with us to secure present possessions and true independence, and avert the danger of a Russian protectorate.

In the first months of last year, Rumania saw herself disappointed in her expectations, and believed herself neglected and forsaken by us. Suddenly, then, there followed the brilliant success in arms, which was generally thought there to be contrary to our wishes. Their blood was up; their resentment expressed itself boldly; Russian intrigue seemed to have obtained a clear path.

The wiser conviction that a certain modification of the present condition in favor of Bulgaria is absolutely necessary for lasting peace in the Balkans, and is not dangerous to the interests of Rumania, can, on the whole, only gain footing if it is carefully prepared by our diplomacy and Germany's, and is put forward with emphasis at the proper moment.

This is the only possible way of keeping Bulgaria permanently in our sphere of attraction. For Bulgaria, expansion into Macedonia is a vital matter. If she cannot secure this in alliance with us, she will unconditionally throw herself into the arms of Russia and support the policy of conquest directed against us.

The Triple Alliance could make no more disastrous mistake than to cast off Bulgaria. A just sense of her own interests should lead Germany to support us in a well-thought-out Bulgarophile policy.

The first task of that sorely tried land would be, it is true, to consolidate her strength, and heal her own wounds. This is a work of several years, during which any aggressive step would be wanton folly. For the present, Bulgarian diplomacy can pursue no other aim than to support peace, and, with our aid and Germany's, bring about better relations with Rumania. This policy can, however, be disturbed by occurrences in Constantinople. We must, therefore, be intent on averting this danger from Bulgaria, and from European peace; in so far as possible to bring about good, intimate relations between Sofia and Constantinople on a peaceable basis.

Should Turkey attempt to surprise Bulgaria, and drag her with herself into a conflict with Greece, we must smooth the way for an understanding between Athens and Sofia, and unite the two lands in joint defense against Turkish attack. Our understanding with Germany must thus have the result, in reference to Bulgaria, that Germany exhibit a friendly course of procedure in regard to Bulgaria, support our counsels of peace there, smooth the way in Bucharest for a combination for the more distant future—on the strength of which, at the proper moment, but in any

case in a relatively distant future, Bulgaria could indemnify herself in Macedonia, without being attacked on account of it by Rumania—and, finally, interpose German influence in Constantinople and Athens, to prevent any possible Turco-Greek conflict from having disastrous consequences for Bulgaria.

This, indeed, would be the most complicated and ticklish point of our united action with Germany. We must, however, find this basis for united action, if we wish to escape quite certain defeat in the face of the systematic proceedings of the Entente powers. If Germany could not be persuaded to join in these prudent ways in a policy friendly to Bulgaria this would, of course, be a mistake from the point of view of German interests also. We should however have to reconcile ourselves to it, and contemplate a union with Rumania and Greece against Serbia and under certain circumstances Bulgaria. Then the detachment of Rumania and Greece from Serbia would be the essential task, and it would be necessary that Germany should move in this direction with all her might.

With respect to Greece, we have every reason, on our part also, for taking a friendly position in regard to that land. It would be easy for us to bring our attitude at Athens into harmony with that of Germany. It is only necessary to work with united strength for a gradual severance of Greco-Serbian relations.

We must, accordingly, before all, consolidate our own strength, and through self-confident but quiet behavior make ourselves felt and inspire confidence.

In the Balkans we must first of all preserve peace and prepare a development agreeable to ourselves. The aims of our Balkan policy we must establish in co-operation with Germany, and labor for a grouping of the Balkan states convenient for us, in which a separation of Rumania and Greece from Serbia would form the first task, and would work toward the reconciliation of these two states with Bulgaria, on the basis of a natural expansion of Bulgaria at Serbia's expense.

This course of action must go hand in hand with a policy in Constantinople that holds back the Turks from every European adventure and seeks to assure to them their Asiatic possessions. Then if there should be a conflagration, the Turk would certainly be found in the anti-Slav camp.

There is no time to lose. All who have to share in the orienting of Austro-Hungarian or of German policy put the heaviest responsibility upon us if we do not adopt, in due time, a well-planned, clear-sighted, consistent course of action.

Count STEFAN TISZA.

BUDAPEST, March 15, 1914.
Copied Jan. 18, 1918.

III.

(TRANSLATION.)

Central Headquarters of the National Labor Party.
No. 3 Karolykör road, BUDAPEST VII.

My highly esteemed Professor:

While returning with thanks the memorandum prepared of our conversation, I have the honor to make the following additional remarks:

1. In regard to the matter of straightening out the Hungarian parliamentary struggle, I intimated both to Berzeviczy, and probably to such other men as would be able to bring it to the notice of the opposition leaders, that if they were inclined to abandon extreme combat tactics I would gladly extend a helping hand for the purpose. In this regard I was revolving in my mind some sort of declaration which would serve to express the fact that the deviation from the provisions of the House rules was an entirely exceptional thing which could not serve as a precedent, and that the rules of the House must be strictly adhered to in the future, as well as possibly such a modification of the established rules of the parliamentary guard as should take into consideration the points represented by the opposition as most offensive.

2. As regards the events preceding the World War, the fact is that I never dreamed, after the assassination at Serajevo, that it would lead to a war. To my infinite regret and grief I was obliged to conclude, from the results of the investigation which established the guilt of the Serbian government and from the statements of Pashitch and the Serbian diplomats as well as of the whole Serbian press (which statements were incredibly provoking and ridiculed and belittled the Monarchy), that we should have to proceed against Serbia. In the first place I took the position that our first note to Serbia should not be in the nature of an ultimatum. I did join in the ultimatum approved by the majority of the government officials concerned, but I mitigated the text thereof and at the Council of Ministers held July 18 at which it was decided to send the ultimatum, I wished to substitute for the first condition the unanimous statement that:

a. We would guarantee the integrity of Serbia provided the Entente would refrain from intermeddling.

b. Even if the war should become general, we declared outright that the Monarchy would not undertake any territorial conquests with the exception of isolated strategical rectifications of boundary. This declaration was actually made at the Council of Ministers of the 18th (it was not a crown council, his Majesty having been at Ischl at the time). The other events leading up to the war occurred at earlier dates.

3. The question of nationality (especially the matter between Hungary and Rumania) was only one of the subjects of the conversations held at Berlin in November, 1914, and continued at the German general military headquarters.

Hoping to meet you at the earliest possible date,

Very respectfully,

TISZA.

BUDAPEST, Jan. 25, 1918.

COMMENTS

In document no. I., in the third paragraph, Professor Marczali is not quite accurate in implying that Emperor William was completely won over in 1913 to a pro-Bulgarian, in place of the pro-Rumanian, policy. The Kaiser still hoped that Austria-Hungary, and especially Count Tisza, would appease Rumania and keep her loyal to the Triple Alliance. This is seen from a letter of Tschirschky to Bethmann, March 23, 1914 (printed by E. Jäckh, "Miramar", in *Deutsche*

Politik, V. 711–718, June 11, 1920), summarizing a conversation which had just taken place between Emperor William and Archduke Francis Ferdinand at Miramar. Francis Joseph and Berchtold, he says, were greatly disturbed over Rumania and Russia. No confidence, they thought, was to be put in the reassuring words which Prince Carol had recently used at Berlin. But all were agreed that they must work for better relations with Rumania. "In regard to the Russian armaments Kaiser William said that these were undeniable, and that we had every reason to watch them sharply, but that he did not believe that they were primarily directed with hostile intent against Austria and Germany." He thought the Russians had in mind taking an advantage of weak conditions in Turkey. The Kaiser praised Tisza, and heard with pleasure that Tisza was having some success in satisfying the Rumanians; all the Rumanians needed was moderate concessions which were quite justifiable.

Mr. Marczali is, however, quite correct in implying that the Rumanian difficulty was the main political question discussed at Konopischt on June 12–13, 1914. Here we have as evidence the report which Baron Treutler, a Prussian minister in personal attendance upon the Kaiser at Konopischt, wrote for the information of the Berlin Foreign Office on June 14 (*cf.* Jäckh, "Konopischt", in *Deutsche Politik,* V. 584–588, May 14, 1920):

His Majesty on the second day of the interview, June 13, had a political discussion with the Archduke both before and after dinner. The first conversation took up the recently arrived telegram from Athens, according to which the differences between Turkey and Greece threatened to assume a serious character [*cf.* a similar telegram from Szilassy in Athens to Berchtold, June 12, printed in Conrad, *Aus Meiner Dienstzeit,* III. 660, according to which the Greeks had called up their marine reserves, had bought four submarines from Germany, and were rumored to be planning an attack on Turkey]. In the course of this conversation I [Treutler] was called in by his Majesty. He gave me, in the Archduke's presence, a résumé of what had been said in the conversation up to this point, which was about as follows. "I have informed the Archduke of the contents of the telegram from Athens. We are agreed that in view of the tenseness in the situation the King of Rumania must be sounded as to how he looks at the situation; whether, and if so by what means, he would attempt to avoid, or eventually hinder, any change in the terms of the Treaty of Bucharest." The Archduke gave a lively assent to these views of his Majesty, and raised the question whether the King [of Rumania] would be really inclined to act. I replied that it was very probable that King Carol would act in the manner desired by us, because his important interest in preserving the Peace of Bucharest coincided with our own. Thereupon it was agreed that his Majesty should send to the Foreign Office the appropriate instructions, and the Archduke promised to beg Count Berchtold to order our minister at

Bucharest to take a similar step. At the end both expressed their agreement in their personal dislike of the King of Bulgaria, and his Majesty related that, according to recent information, the King of Bulgaria was aware of their dislike, but was earnestly trying to win them both over.

Concerning the second conversation, which took place after dinner with no one else present, his Majesty told me the next morning the following. [After a long discussion in which the Archduke expressed his suspicions of Italy's *mala fides* and Emperor William tried to allay the suspicions of his host], the conversation then turned to Hungary, and here the Archduke gave expression to his dislike more sharply and in uncommonly clear terms. He pictured Hungarian conditions as wholly medieval and anachronistic. . . . It made little difference what man stood at the head; every Hungarian strove more or less openly to secure advantages for Hungary at the expense of Austria, and to the disadvantage of the Monarchy as a whole. The Archduke was quite aware, he [William II.] said, that the Kaiser [William II.] had gained a very good impression of Tisza; but that this was perhaps not well founded, for Tisza's deeds did not correspond with Tisza's words. In truth Tisza was already dictator in Hungary [the Archduke said], and was striving to become one in Vienna also. "Already Vienna begins to tremble when Tisza starts for the city; everyone lies flat on his stomach, when Tisza steps out at Vienna." . . . His Majesty interrupted the Archduke to say that he naturally disapproved of Tisza when he heard that he was insubordinate and was attempting to shift the centre of gravity of the Monarchy to Austria's disadvantage. His Majesty regarded Tisza, he said, as such a powerful and unusual man that he could only advise that Tisza should not be thrown overboard, but should be kept under a firm hand and then used for his valuable qualities.

I have the impression [adds Treutler] that his Majesty was aiming successfully to meet the Archduke halfway, without making him suspicious through a too sudden expression of his own well-known good opinion of Tisza. On his side the Archduke very cleverly emphasized from his point of view the fact that it was precisely Tisza who was to blame, if the interests of the Triple Alliance were badly looked after, since it was Tisza who, in contradiction with his own promises at Schönbrunn, had been maltreating the Rumanians in Hungary. The Archduke finally begged his Majesty whether he would not instruct Tschirschky to remind Tisza at every opportunity that he should not lose sight of the necessity of winning over the Rumanians through moderation in the treatment of their brothers who were living in Hungary. His Majesty promised he would instruct Tschirschky continually to repeat to Tisza, "Sir! Remember the Rumanians!" The Archduke greatly approved of this.

This circumstantial account of the Konopischt meeting, together with other material now available, makes it clear that the main topic of conversation was the problematical attitude of Rumania. One gets a glimpse of the Archduke Francis Ferdinand's dislike of Magyars in general and Tisza in particular, and the consequent chaos of conflicting influences in Austrian domestic and foreign policy. Tisza's plan for a *politique de longue main*—peace, recuperation, and the winning of Bulgaria to the side of Germany and Austria—as set

forth in document no. II., seems hardly to have been mentioned, if at all, at Konopischt. Professor Marczali seems to go too far in saying that "on his visit to Konopischt, the Emperor treated already on this basis with the Archduke". Tisza, however, away at Budapest, may very well have hoped, or perhaps even believed, that his memoir of March 15 was being given at Konopischt the serious consideration which it deserved. What the Kaiser did aim to do at Konopischt was to smooth out the internal conflicts which were weakening the Dual Monarchy as an ally, and to remove the tendencies which were threatening to alienate Rumania. This simple and straightforward account of the meeting on June 12–13 should put an end to the fantastic legends about mysterious plottings to carve up Europe in a world war, which were broadcasted by Mr. Wickham-Steed (*cf.* "The Pact of Konopischt", in the *Nineteenth Century and After,* LXXIX. 253–273, February, 1916), and which have been elaborated by credulous and imaginative French writers (*cf.* J. Chopin, *Le Complot de Sarajevo,* Paris, 1918, pp. 80–88; J. Pozzi, "Les Roses de Konopischt", in *Le Correspondant,* June 10, 1921; R. Recouly, *Les Heures Tragiques d'Avant Guerre,* Paris, 1922, pp. 173–194; A. Dumaine, *La Dernière Ambassade de France en Autriche,* Paris, 1921, pp. 126–129); and have even been accepted by such a careful historian as A. Debidour, *Histoire Diplomatique de l'Europe* (Paris, 1918), II. 229.

Document no. II., already published by W. Fraknói, gives Tisza's matured and keen conclusions as to the only means of salvation for Austria-Hungary after the disastrous effects of the Balkan wars. It is therefore of capital importance. It gives the Hungarian premier's unquestionable fundamental convictions: (1) That Rumania was uncertain and therefore Germany and Austria should seek to attach Bulgaria to the Triple Alliance group, and make Sofia instead of Bucharest their pivot in the Balkans; otherwise Bulgaria would be bribed by the promise of Macedonia to join with the Entente group; "thereby the long-desired moment would arrive when Russia and France could foment the world war with prospect of success, and attack Germany with superior forces." (2) That the Dual Monarchy must adopt "a well-planned, clear-sighted, consistent course of action", and seek to make itself "understood, appreciated, and supported by Germany". This hints at the continual conflicts and friction which had been developing between Berlin and Vienna ever since 1908. These were little known prior to the publication of Conrad von Hoetzendorf's autobiographic compilation of documents, but, when fully understood, should modify the current legend that

Austria and Germany worked in harmony before the war, the former being little more than the tool of the latter. This legend naturally gained currency after the war started, because of the desire to make Germany solely responsible, and of the fact that during the war the German military authorities did in reality so completely dominate Austria-Hungary both in military and diplomatic matters. (3) That the Dual Monarchy, as well as Bulgaria, needed peace " for several years ", and that the preservation of this peace must be the prime aim of the Triple Alliance.

Document no. II. is also important because it probably formed the basis (in a much modified form) of the famous memorandum which Berchtold and his assistants drew up for presentation at Berlin as a proposed guide for Austro-German policy in the Balkans. This memorandum, more or less embodying Tisza's peace policy, was completed before the Serajevo assassination; after this event Berchtold added a postscript denouncing Serbia as responsible and declaring that now at last Austria must " seize with a strong hand the threads which its enemies are weaving into a net over its head, and tear them once for all ". This memorandum with the postscript, together with a similar letter composed by Berchtold from Francis Joseph to William II., were the famous documents presented to the Kaiser at Potsdam on July 5. Both documents were double-faced: in the first and longer part they advocated Tisza's *politique de longue main*—peace, recuperation, and a shift in the Balkan alliances; in the closing sentences they suggested immediate military action against Serbia. Tisza was not informed of the postscript nor of the royal letter until after they had been despatched to Potsdam; when he finally saw them, he disapproved of their wording and tone.

If Tisza's convictions were as stated above, and as expressed in the memorable scene before the Countess Tisza which Professor Marczali describes and which there is every reason to believe is an honest statement of Tisza's horror of war, why, it may be asked, did he afterwards consent to the ultimatum to Serbia? This has been to many historians a baffling mystery. Tisza himself partly solves it in document no. III. His change of attitude in mid-July was " due to the results of the investigation [at Serajevo] which established the guilt of the Serbian government ", and to the " statements of Pashitch and the Serbian diplomats as well as the whole Serbian press, which statements were incredibly provoking and ridiculed and belittled the Monarchy ". Probably his change of attitude was also due in part to misrepresentations by Berchtold which Tisza was too generous to denounce afterwards. As Professor Marczali points out, Tisza re-

fused to allow him to publish their conversation. "He did not state the reason for his refusal, but to me it was evident. If not he, others would be responsible. To leave the matter in that shape was incompatible with his character."

A note may be added as to document no. III., *ad fin.*, "held July 18", etc. By a slip of memory Tisza mentions July 18 as the date of the Council of Ministers at which the final draft of the ultimatum to Serbia was discussed. It was in fact on Sunday, July 19, as indicated by the minutes of the Council itself, published in the *Austrian Red Book* of 1919, vol. I., no. 26, some months after Tisza wrote this letter. The minutes do not bring out clearly the first condition on which he says he insisted, "*a.* We would guarantee", etc., but they do confirm the accuracy of his second condition, "*b.* Even if the war", etc.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

REVIEWS OF BOOKS

GENERAL BOOKS AND BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

The Cambridge Ancient History. Edited by J. B. Bury, F.B.A., S. A. Cook, Litt.D., F. E. Adcock. In eight volumes. Volume I. *Egypt and Babylonia to 1580 B.C.* (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1923. Pp. xxii, 704. 35 s.)

This is a book not merely of great size but of equally great comprehensiveness, and to evaluate it justly far exceeds either the learning or the capacity of any one man, even as many have co-operated in its making. Its perspective can only be estimated if its contents be placed before the reader, and the choice of its writers judged only if they be named. Here then is its table of contents in the briefest possible outline. Chapter I., Primitive Man, in Geological Times, and chapter II., Neolithic and Bronze Age Cultures, are both by Professor John L. Myres, of Oxford, and fill 110 big pages; chapter III., Exploration and Excavation, by Professor R. A. Stewart Macalister, University College, of Dublin, fills only 44 pages and attempts to tell the story of excavations and decipherment in Egypt, Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine, Hittites, Aegean civilization, and Cyprus. In my judgment this is a worthless chapter. The space allotted is quite inadequate and the result nothing. No intelligent reader could possibly secure from this any vivid picture either of the processes of excavation or of the decipherment. Macalister has absolutely proven his skill and displayed his success in the field in Palestine. It was bad generalship to require or permit him to do this thing in this way. Chapter IV. is devoted to Chronology, its subsections on Mesopotamia and on the Old Testament by Dr. Stanley A. Cook, Egypt by Dr. H. R. Hall, and Prehistoric Greece by A. J. B. Wace of the British School in Athens. So far as I am competent to judge, omitting prehistoric Greece, on which I have no authority, this is an excellent chapter. Cook has admirably and exactly stated the case as regards the Old Testament, and I entertain an equally high estimate of the work of Hall, with the single caveat that I do not now any more than before have the slightest confidence in that will o' the wisp, the introduction of the calendar in 4241 B. C. O astronomy, what chronological sins have been committed in thy name! Chapter V., the Semites, by S. A. Cook (pp. 181–237), is admirably, even in places splendidly, done. It covers the people, language, and monuments, temperament and thought, social and political development, treatment of history, Syria and Palestine. Chapter VI., Egypt: the Predynastic Period, by Professor T. Eric Peet, Liverpool (pp. 238–255), is a badly skimped chapter, too

brief to give an adequate picture. On a much larger scale are chapters VII., the Union of Egypt and the Old Kingdom, and VIII., the Middle Kingdom and the Hyksos Conquest, both by Dr. H. R. Hall, and entirely satisfactory alike in scope, in content, and in the disposition of materials. There was in Britain nobody so well qualified to do this thing. When done one recognizes at once the museum touch. Hall has lived in the British Museum in daily contact with the materials of which history is made, and not only that but had been frequently arrested by the arrival of some new inscription or bit of antiquity which must be classified and related to earlier knowledge. This it is which cultivates an openness of mind, a readiness to restate former opinions, or to formulate new ones. Chapter IX., Life and Thought in Egypt under the Old and Middle Kingdoms (pp. 326–354), by Peet, is again a chapter far too short to cover its field with any adequacy. Chapter X., Early Babylonia and its Cities, by Professor Stephen H. Langdon, of Oxford (pp. 356–401), is a dreary catalogue of dead names which the pen of genius must some day make living and vocal. There is no lack of learning here, for Langdon is prodigiously learned. What fails is imagination, the divine gift which should take these poor and arid tales of early Sumerian man and, leaving out some names which learning holds valid but are always and ever dead, throw the rest upon a broad-scaled picture. Say not that this is impossible. None of us have yet done it, but Grote did it for early Greece, and Gibbon for dreary episodes in the Middle Ages. Chapters XI., the Dynasties of Akkad and Lagash, and XII., the Sumerian Revival: the Empire of Ur, likewise by Langdon, are more interesting, yet also disappointing. Here Langdon had a far more inviting field and has made very little of it. It seems a pity that the figure of Sargon I. did not rise majestic before him, with power to draw about his personality as a great drapery events and places. But to Langdon he is only a name, an interesting name philologically, but a mere lay figure stuffed with sawdust. Chapter XIII. is on Isin, Larsa, and Babylon. Here there enters on the stage a new figure, R. Campbell Thompson, already well known as a skillful editor and interpreter of Babylonian texts, and at once in his historical writing one feels a new note. Thompson has been personally an excavator and knows the modern Orient, which for us must always be the background of the ancient history. His imagination has been kindled by his experiences in the field and scattered along in his writing there are discernible hints of the present to give light on the past. He quotes from an inscription of Hammurabi and with it in parenthesis writes: "One may see great piles of grain to this day on the banks of a canal, covered over with reed mats for protection." Or as he pictures lower Babylonia "still subject far inland to the tides, where a man must dig a hole at the edge to find sweet water for drinking". Or he pauses to describe a sea-going vessel at Basrah, and on page 497 gives quite the most vivid picture of ancient life which this whole big book contains. Thompson also writes chapter XIV., the Golden Age of

Hammurabi, wherein he had the greatest commission which this book afforded anybody. He has done it well, but hardly brilliantly, even though paragraphs of real quality are not wanting. Let us not be querulous, seeking the ideal and not content with and grateful for the gift that is offered. We shall some day need a Gibbon to do justice to Hammurabi. Chapter XV., by Thompson, is not much more than a catalogue of names and dates; probably nothing more could now be secured. Chapter XVI., the Art of Early Egypt and Babylonia, by Dr. Hall, is on a meagre scale and produces small effect. The Egyptian part of it is absurdly inadequate, and the best thing in it is the description of Hall's own startling discovery of copper lions at El-Obeid. Chapter XVII., Early Aegean Civilization, by A. J. B. Wace, seems to me a sound piece of work with which to conclude the book. After it come bibliographies, good but far from complete, and valuable tables of chronology. It is as useful a book as it is big. I should like to call it a great book, but I dare not. For reference it will be always in frequent demand, but it is almost wholly bereft of style and its tediousness over great areas is depressing. Who will ever have the boldness to read the whole of it for sheer pleasure? And if there were one so bold would he not need to take heed lest its very virtues, where and when they exist, should lead him astray? If I am challenged to cite an illustration I shall point to the grotesque explanation of Mongol physiognomy offered by Myres (p. 22), and in Langdon's work there are many, in which ingenuity has taken the place of judgment and the sorely misused word "probable" dominates the land, as in the sentence: "Through this pass the Sumerians probably descended into the valley of the two rivers from the highlands of Iran and central Asia" (p. 357). Would to heaven that we knew enough of this great people either to accept or refuse this solution! What is the chief lack of this volume? It is Leonard W. King, who died too soon!

ROBERT W. ROGERS.

From Augustus to Augustine: Essays and Studies dealing with the Contact and Conflict of Classic Paganism and Christianity. By ERNEST G. SIHLER, Ph.D., Hon.Litt.D., Professor of the Latin Language and Literature in New York University. (Cambridge: University Press. 1923. Pp. xi, 335. 12 s. 6 d.)

IN his *Testimonium Animae*, published in 1908, Dr. Sihler on the basis of his extensive and detailed learning argued the inadequacy of the spiritual element in classical civilization in comparison with the power of Christian conviction. The essays of that work covered the period from Homer to the first Christian century. The present work continues the theme for the period of contact and conflict between the two systems of life. Dr. Sihler justly claims that in these expositions of pagan and Christian authors he has not leaned on the historian, secular or ecclesiastical, and the value of his fresh independent studies

with their many provocative reflective comments is to be gratefully acknowledged. Doubtless the estimates and reflections may excite dissent, as, for example, the disparaging account of the Emperor Julian, while, again, our knowledge and understanding is certainly enriched by the chapter on Old Roman Believers and the Dusk of the Gods. In brief, the book is an important and serious contribution for students of the period, always interesting, though deficient in sympathy and often stiff and awkward in expression.

Waiving detail, one main criticism is due. Dr. Sihler commends his studies to persons of theological education. If their education in Church history has been of a modern type, they will surely agree that the theme for study in the Ancient Church period is the historical evolutionary problem: How did the ancient society pass from polytheistic paganism to the form dominated by the Christian Church? The solution of the problem is the discovery of a process of assimilation by which the rigorously ethical Palestinian preaching absorbed the higher culture of the Mediterranean civilization, finding affinity with its highest ethics, adopting something of ritual expression from its cults, becoming philosophical by the substitution of cosmological theory for the imagery of Palestinian inheritance. Such a student is interested in finding these higher tendencies in paganism and in doing them at least as much justice as was done by Justin Martyr or Clement of Alexandria in the very process of this assimilation. He knows that by reason of the aristocratic exclusiveness of pagan culture, and its incapacity to reform the untaught masses, the ethical and spiritual advance of the pagan world did not characterize the rank and file. Dr. Sihler on the other hand seems concerned to disparage the pagan progress made by the higher minds, to emphasize the survival in the masses of premoral and prerational notions and ritual acts. It is his fault also to treat as religious phenomenon what was simply a product of the *Lust zum Fabulieren*. He gives to paganism thus a very seamy side and arrives at the extravagance of saying: "We must take back almost all the terms which we apply to religion, faith, creed, or worship, church or prayer, remove from them all they now contain or connote for us or in us, and make of them quite positively empty shells before we can even conceive what they meant in the classic world." This is in fact to pour out the baby in emptying the bath, to eliminate from a mass of religious phenomena the distinctively religious element. This rather extreme case may illustrate the main objection of a critical reader: the failure, that is, to view the facts by the illumination of an evolutionary construction. Not only would paganism look a little better in that light—and it is a pleasure to refer to the interesting work of Friedrich Heiler, *Das Gebet*—but Dr. Sihler would not then be so much annoyed by survivals of pagan thought in Christian authors like Clement and Augustine.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.

BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

Histoire de la Nation Française. Dirigée par GABRIEL HANOTAUX, de l'Académie Française. Tome XIII. *Histoire des Lettres,* volume II., *De Ronsard à Nos Jours.* Par FORTUNAT STROWSKI, Professeur à la Sorbonne. (Paris: Plon-Nourrit et Cie. 1923. Pp. 614. Unbound, 48 fr.; bound, 74 fr.)

THIS is the continuation of tome XII., *Histoire des Lettres, Première Partie,* by the three eminent scholars, François Picavet, Joseph Bédier, and Alfred Jeanroy, reviewed in volume XXVII. (pp. 547–548) of this journal.

In the second, and last, volume dealing with literature Fortunat Strowski draws a broad and very skillful picture of a literature overwhelmingly rich in great names and works. It is the most ambitious attempt yet made (with the first volume just mentioned) to revive the *genre* of the general survey; quite naturally this is coming to be in favor again as a reaction against the type of work long in favor the aim of which was exclusively to impart information. Of course the latter type had itself been partly a reaction against the too easy history of literature which most of the time had meant only more or less eloquent developments of a few commonplaces in the field of literature; and this again was only a poor and degenerate form of the once much honored and legitimate *tableau,* or *discours.* Thus, after having followed a sharp curve we come back to the manner of presentation illustrated by Voltaire (*e.g.*, in his *Siècle de Louis XIV.*) or by Villemain (*Tableau de la Littérature au XVIII^{me} Siècle*); or, in history, by Bossuet (*Discours sur l'Histoire Universelle*) or by Condorcet (*Esquisse d'un Tableau Historique du Progrès de l'Esprit Humain*).

Mr. Strowski's work will be of service to those who desire a general introduction to the French literature of the four last centuries or to those who, having already a general knowledge, need help to grasp the relations existing between the various writers or periods.

There is no bibliography, no index—and neither can be expected in a work of that kind; but the amount of concrete information that the author has succeeded at times in introducing, without in the least impairing the clearness of the presentation, is striking. With very few exceptions he has used the last and most reliable erudition available (like Magne, Abbé Cornou, Zyromski, etc.). Moreover, Mr. Strowski leads us down to the very present day: Bergsonism is the title of one paragraph; the philosophies of Barrès and of Maurras are briefly explained; and many other names appear of men who either have only just earned fame, like Marcel Proust, or Louis Hémon (the author of *Maria Chapdelaine*), or who are still with us in bones and flesh, Claudel and Courteline, Jules Romains, Gaston Chérau, and even Henri Brémond with his *Histoire Littéraire du Sentiment Religieux en*

France depuis la Fin de la Ligue jusqu'à Nos Jours—still in course of publication.

At times, the grouping of material is somewhat surprising, and one suspects that some name that did not find a place in the chapter to which it logically belonged, and which however could not be left out entirely, had to be surreptitiously introduced in some out-of-the-way corner (*e.g.*, Gassendi, the philosopher, who ought to have been a neighbor to Descartes, is found in the chapter on Molière, or Balzac is put among the "utopian novelists", which hardly seems a natural classification)—but such minor imperfections are unavoidable in a work conceived by a human brain.

The one more serious criticism that we should feel inclined to make of this otherwise brilliant book is the apparent indifference, at least in some chapters, to the connection between historical events and literary works. If the volume was not part of a *Histoire de la Nation Française*, this remark would perhaps not be so much to the point; but, when one reads the volume with this circumstance in mind, one regrets the opportunities missed by failing to point out the interdependence of history and literature. This aloofness is not equally true of all parts; for instance, the part treating the second half of the nineteenth century is excellent from this point of view; but the seventeenth century is much less so. There are many pages devoted to Bossuet, to his sermons and funeral eulogies, but the problem of Gallicanism is not even mentioned; the style of Fénelon's *Télémaque* is alone important; Saint-Simon is briefly treated, with no emphasis on his *Mémoires* as historical (or non-historical) work—just as, in the sixteenth century, the historical writings of Agrippa d'Aubigné had been ignored altogether. It is even a greater pity that in the eighteenth century we miss a treatment of Voltaire and of Rousseau which would leave with the reader the impression that these two men have been actual forces in the evolution of French ideas in the right direction. Mr. Strowski seems to consider them mainly as writers who *entertained* their contemporaries, or then, only knew how to mislead them. Voltaire is "le premier des journalistes"; and the author's chapter on Rousseau is followed by this sentence: "Let us complete our study, so as not to be *too* unjust, by that of a disciple" who had some lovable traits. But why be "unjust" at all? The real credit of the Revolution goes all to the Encyclopaedists: "The ferocious men of the Revolution come from Rousseau; and the great constructors of the Revolution come from his enemies, the Philosophes" (p. 440). Again, in discussing Chateaubriand's work the political or historical significance is left in the background. And since Fustel is regarded (and rightly so) as belonging to literature, why not—as was done in the cases of Montesquieu, Taine, and Renan—lay stress on the fundamental philosophical ideas of his writings, instead of merely giving him high, but general praise as a *littérateur*?

Albert Schinz.

Interpretations of Legal History. By ROSCOE POUND, Ph.D., LL.D., Carter Professor of Jurisprudence in Harvard University. [Cambridge Studies in English Legal History, edited by HAROLD DEXTER HAZELTINE, Litt.D.] (Cambridge: University Press; New York: Macmillan Company. 1923. Pp. xix, 171. 12 s. 6 d.)

THIS book is composed of seven lectures delivered in 1922 by Dean Pound at Trinity College in Cambridge University. "They do not essay", to quote the words of the author (p. xvi), "even a history of the historical jurisprudence of the nineteenth century. They have to do with one aspect thereof only, namely, the way in which the historical school understood legal history and the relation of its interpretations to the purposes of the time." "Attempts", he continues (pp. 2, 3), "to unify or to reconcile stability and change, to make the legal order appear something fixed and settled and beyond question, while at the same time allowing adaptation to the pressure of infinite and variable human desires, have proceeded along three main lines—authority, philosophy, and history." . . . "In its earliest form the idea of authority appears as belief in a divinely ordained or divinely dictated body of rules, as in Hammurabi's code, handed him by the Sun-god ready made, or the Mosaic law, or the laws of Manu, dictated to the sages by Manu's son in Manu's presence and by his direction. In its latest form it is a dogma that law is a body of commands of the sovereign power in a politically organized society, resting ultimately on whatever basis is conceived to be behind the capacity of that sovereign." . . . "The actual legal order is not a simple rational thing. It is a complex, more or less irrational thing into which we struggle to put reason and in which, as fast as we have put some part of it in the order of reason, new irrationalities arise in the process of meeting new needs by trial and error" (p. 21).

Stability in law is treated as a secondary consideration.

> English law is less and less determined by precedent, and the conception of it as a controlling authority is fading away. . . . In England the reign of this method was relatively brief. In the United States it reigned longer and more autocratically and is only just disappearing from law teaching. For in America the philosophical and creative ideas of the eighteenth century persisted much longer than in England because the law-of-nature theory was the theory of our bill of rights and so was classical in our constitutional law and because the reception of the common law of England as the law of a pioneer society called for examination of every item with reference to its applicability to American institutions and conditions and hence for a certain creative attitude. The work of selection and reception was complete by the time of the Civil War, and the jurists of the last third of the century were in reaction from the ideas of the formative period of American common law, much as Savigny was in reaction from the juristic ideas of the end of the eighteenth century. (Pp. 50, 51.)

Professor Pound emphasizes the fact that law is a changing complex. "Experiments in psychological forms of ethnological interpretation are a link between the nineteenth-century search for a single all-explaining formula of legal development and the recognition of a plurality of factors which marks the juristic thought of today" (p. 74).

The law of a case before a court may not seem the same to every judge. His personal equation has its influence. The author dwells on this, and attributes more weight to it than it probably deserves. "Liability without regard to fault for things done or maintained upon land will appeal differently to judges in a highly organized society whose natural resources have been fully developed than to judges in a pioneer country whose natural resources are under exploitation. In the former courts will be likely to think in terms of preserving existing wealth. In the latter they will think in terms of 'permutation of opportunity into wealth'" (pp. 105, 106).

"Nineteenth-century jurists sought . . . in the administration of justice . . . to eliminate all individualization of application. They put their faith in a closed system of rules mechanically developed by inflexible logic and mechanically administered. It would have been highly inconvenient to recognize a personal creative element in the origin or operation of this closed system and in the fashioning and setting up of its institutions. Hence that element was not seen and the assumption of a self-developing legal history was put behind the assumption of a mechanically self-acting law" (p. 127).

This book is one of permanent value. It digs at the roots of the Anglo-Saxon law. The spade is not spared. The work is well done and will be particularly helpful to all students of comparative law and jurisprudence.

SIMEON E. BALDWIN.

Lords Lieutenants in the Sixteenth Century: a Study in Tudor Local Administration. By GLADYS SCOTT THOMSON, M.A., F. R. Hist. Soc., Member of Somerville College, Oxford, Tutor of St. Hugh's College, Oxford. (London and New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1923. Pp. xii, 182. 9s.)

THIS book fills one of many gaps in our knowledge of local administration under the Tudors. On the whole it is adequate to its purpose. For the most part it concerns itself with the lords lieutenants under Queen Elizabeth. It is based almost altogether on unpublished material in the Public Record Office, in the Lambeth Palace Library, and in other public and private repositories. No important source of information on the subject of it has apparently been left unsounded. There is plenty of room for dispute as to the interpretation of the facts which it presents, but it does present the facts.

Miss Thomson disagrees with Strype's statement that the office of lord lieutenant originated in 1549. She finds officers bearing the same title and exercising similar functions at least as early as 1536. But she concedes that the office assumed its more characteristic attributes about the middle of the sixteenth century. She has a good deal to say about the personnel of the office and about its territorial limits. She calls attention once more to the fact that its main business was that of organizing the fighting strength of England. In this connection she points out that the lords lieutenants were at once prominent men at court, usually privy councillors, and prominent landowners in the regions of their authority. They were evidently intended in part to serve as a connecting link between the local and the central administration for military affairs at least, and the temptation was always present to utilize them in a similar capacity for civil affairs. Occasionally they were so used. One gets the impression that they might easily develop into a position similar to that of *gouverneur* in sixteenth-century France. But the Tudors were always wary of any drift in the direction of a reconstituted feudal régime. It was perhaps for this reason that they never gave to the lord lieutenancy a permanent or a fixed character. Throughout its earlier history it partook rather of the nature of a temporary expedient to meet a temporary emergency than of an established organ of government.

Miss Thomson devotes her two concluding chapters to a consideration of the military organization of England under the lords lieutenants and to the other administrative functions of these officers. Her description of the musters is good as far as it goes. It might have gone further to advantage. A little more light would certainly have been welcome upon the obscure matter of the local assessments levied somehow or other to meet the expenses of the musters. She is also rather disappointingly brief upon the whole question of military service overseas. It must be regarded as a little unfortunate that in her consideration of this important matter she has focused her whole attention upon the French expedition of 1591 rather than upon the Low Country wars which were certainly more typical, though no doubt much more tedious.

From her discussion of the general administrative duties of the lord lieutenant it becomes clear that this officer occupied a position of *primus inter pares* relative to the justices of the peace of his bailiwick. Even in those matters which were particularly referred to him, like the collection of "privy seals" and the enforcement of religious uniformity, his business appears to have been rather to stimulate the activities of the J. P.'s and to unify their efforts than to exercise authority peculiar to himself. One wonders to what extent Queen Elizabeth was beginning to feel the necessity of some closer watch on the J. P.'s, who were naturally rather more apt to represent county sentiment than crown sentiment when matters touching their own interests were involved. Miss Thomson does not hint at anything of this sort. She seems on the whole rather more strongly impressed by the undeviating loyalty of the J. P. than the facts

quite warrant. A careful study of the *Acts of the Privy Council* between the critical years of 1570 and 1590 would have revealed to her the difficulties which faced the Privy Council in keeping the J. P.'s at distasteful tasks.

The book lacks a bibliography but contains an interesting prefatory note on authorities, which would be more valuable if it were more explicit. To cite the State Papers, Domestic, is about as vague as to cite the British Museum. There is, by the way, a small manuscript book containing a partial list of lords lieutenants and their deputies for the year 1585 in Harleian MSS. 474 which seems to have escaped the author's attention.

Conyers Read.

Great Britain and Prussia in the Eighteenth Century: being the Ford Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford, Lent Term, 1922. By Sir Richard Lodge, LL.D., Litt.D., Professor of History in the University of Edinburgh. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford University Press. 1923. Pp. x, 221. 14s.)

During the war writers were found in both Britain and Germany who traced the roots of their antagonism to remote centuries. Against this "degradation of history to be the handmaid of political passion" Sir Richard Lodge offers his "passive protest" in a book which is based throughout on the original records and in many points on unprinted material. Though "impressed by the difficulty of interesting either hearers or readers in the details of obsolete diplomacy", he succeeds admirably in explaining the main currents of eighteenth-century diplomacy—no easy task—and, if complaint be made that he breaks off abruptly with 1791, Sir Richard will point to his promise to pursue the matter to 1815 and will doubtless insist that there is no moral to be pointed.

For in spite of two periods of alliance, 1756–1761 and 1788–1791, Britain and Prussia had few points of contact, if indeed Hanover and Prussia had many. An alliance between them was a *pis aller*. Except Pitt, English statesmen much preferred the "old system" of the Austrian alliance and constantly tried to bridge the chasm between Berlin and Vienna. Prussian politicians clung to France as long as possible. Each country was willing to use the other to gain its own ends, but since France was the enemy of one and Austria of the other, "there existed . . . no adequate binding force to hold Britain and Prussia permanently together"; otherwise diplomatic representation would not have been left for long periods to secretaries of legation or even unofficial agents.

Professor Lodge is eminently fair. He condemns the "indefensible actions" of Newcastle in precipitating the war of 1756 with France, remarks that the arguments for repudiating the Convention of Kloster-Zeven were "not very edifying", and labels the abandonment of the subsidy treaty by Bute as "one of the least creditable episodes in the history of English diplomacy". But he is equally severe on Frederick II., who,

he shows, deliberately violated the Convention of Westminster by his invasion of Saxony; the Prussian hero was also guilty of many mistakes and miscalculations. The book exhibits throughout a refreshing candor and dry humor which carry one along in spite of tedious negotiations, and there are pleasing sketches of several forgotten diplomatists, especially Joseph Ewart, who was at Berlin from 1782 to 1792.

The peculiar position of Hanover is constantly emphasized, for the problem confronting the Georges was not very different from that which the British government has to face to-day in evolving a foreign policy acceptable to the whole empire; with only negative conclusions, however, for each difficulty was met by an opportunist solution. Another modern note was sounded when the British minister in Berlin reported in 1748 that "there is no power on earth the King of Prussia respects more than Russia"; while Frederick wrote, "tant que je m'entendrai et serai d'accord avec l'Angleterre, je n'aurai rien à appréhender de la Russie". This was the sum and substance of Bismarck's policy after 1871, which his successors abandoned to their undoing.

BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT.

La Franc-Maçonnerie Belge sous le Régime Autrichien (1721–1794): Étude Historique et Critique. Par BERTRAND VAN DER SCHELDEN, O.M.C., Docteur en Sciences Morales et Historiques. [Université de Louvain, Recueil de Travaux publiés par les Membres des Conférences d'Histoire et de Philologie, 2me série, 1er fascicule.] (Louvain: Librairie Universitaire. 1923. Pp. xii, 446. 22 fr.)

OF books on freemasonry there is no dearth. The two-volume bibliography of Wolfstieg (1911) contains more than forty thousand entries. Nor has the rather feeble development of the society in Belgium in the eighteenth century been hitherto neglected, for we have Duchaine's documented history of freemasonry in Belgium in that century published in 1911. This work on the same topic by a Catholic historian seeks to throw new light on the subject by a thorough exploitation of the archives of Vienna and Naples and of Belgian cities and provinces, supplemented by all available contemporary printed material. The results are interesting but not startling nor of wide significance.

Freemasonry never had a very vigorous development in Belgium. This work shows the first chartered lodges beginning a precarious existence fifty years after the first date given by Father Van der Schelden in his title. In 1786 there were scarcely thirty lodges, in contrast with several thousand in the neighboring Germany and France. The Belgian lodges maintained but a slight connection, stronger however than has been supposed, with the mother lodge in London under which they originated. The French relations were even less significant. Poor leadership at the start, infrequent meetings of even local lodges, failure

to pay dues, dissensions between Alost and Ghent as to precedence, irregular lodges, the question of admitting women, royal and clerical disfavor, troubled the two decades after 1764. The membership, although small, was chiefly among the younger aristocracy. Their servants were initiated, but served behind their masters' chairs and ate at their own tables later at Masonic functions. Nevertheless the theory of equality, the doctrine of naturalism, and the general teaching and symbolism of the society were an expression and a contributing factor in the ideas of the eighteenth century that are the background of the Revolution.

The third part (pp. 181–334) deals with the attitude of government and Church and has more general interest. Maria Theresia was hostile to Masonry and under the urgency of the papal nuncio meditated but never executed a decree against it. The empress, although a good daughter of the Church, had in Kaunitz and Cobenzl advisers who were high in Masonry. Her Belgian officials pretended ignorance of the order's existence. The excesses of a lodge of students at Louvain brought a direct command for its suppression and instructions for adverse action against others but "*sans éclat*". The society was well advised of its peril and suspended for two years. Joseph II., absolutist and Febronian, did not exclude Masonry from his all-inclusive regulations. But his edict of December 11, 1785, limiting the number of lodges to three in Brussels, was given out (January 4, 1786) in a version much modified by his officials in Belgium and with all derogatory reflections on the order omitted. The Privy Council in Brussels gave it a favorable interpretation, closely adopting the requests of the Grand Master, and all but four lodges were allowed to continue if they reported meeting-places, officers, and membership, and otherwise conformed to the edict. Kaunitz's adroit presentation of the whole matter to Joseph was a plea for his approval, but the emperor flatly insisted that his decree as he wrote it should be enforced in Belgium as elsewhere. This meant the end of organized Masonry in the Low Countries. Only one of the three lodges permitted in Brussels was alive in 1789. A few of those in other cities persisted feebly *sub rosa*. The Belgian lodges as such seem to have held strictly to the rule of the society not to mix in civil matters. In the Brabançon revolution Masons, acting as individuals, were on the lists of those who opposed Joseph's measures.

Why Catholics and even priests freely joined, despite papal bulls against Masonry in 1738 and 1751, the author finds it difficult to explain. The bulls were not widely published, were not cited by the rector when he suppressed the lodge at Louvain in 1777; yet they were not wholly unknown, as the Masonic archives show. The explanation, as the author states it, is either that Catholics did not know of them, doubted their existence, or did not consider them binding as they had never received the royal *placet*. The suggestion that the philosophy of Masonry was so little understood or so plausibly reconciled with their faith that Catholics did not realize its basic divergence from their faith and the commands of the pope is elaborated and may be taken for what it is

worth. The author's effort as historical scholar to portray the psychology of Masonic priests and Catholics in the setting of the eighteenth century is much more illuminating. The current philosophy with its desire for peace, for brotherhood, for equality, its rationalism, and yet its inclinations to mysticism and magic, impulses which found no adequate outlet in the existing political or religious order, might well turn to Masonry and Rosicrucianism or in less enlightened ways to Cagliostro and Mesmer. The century was Voltairean. Voltaire derived his ideas from English philosophy and Masonry was of like origin. With these premises the author argues that Masonic teachings were therefore philosophy à la mode.

One hundred pages of appendixes give lists of members, bibliography, and archival documents.

The Continental System: an Economic Interpretation. By ELI F. HECKSCHER, D.Phil., Professor of Political Economy at the University College of Commerce, Stockholm. Edited by HARALD WESTERGAARD, Professor of Political Science in the University of Copenhagen. [Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.] (Oxford: Clarendon Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1922. Pp. xvi, 420. 10 s. 6d.)

CRITERIA for appraising this monograph are offered by editor and author in several frank prefaces. "The book represents a sort of synthesis of earlier studies of the mercantile system and its outgrowths, on the one side, and the results of extensive theoretical and practical work—private, academic, and governmental—in the field of present-day war-economics, on the other." Despite the "atmosphere of a rather strict blockade in a neutral country" the author has pursued, with "a purely scientific aim", his examination of "three principal questions": "1. In what economic ideas did the Continental System originate? 2. What was its actual economic bearing? 3. In what manner did it correspond to its aim?." This inquiry, undertaken under adverse conditions for a personal academic occasion in May, 1918, and later retouched for its English version, has faults of production, revision, and translation for which the author is duly apologetic. He reminds us also that the book is only a "survey", "economic in character", and that "an even approximately exhaustive treatment has not been attempted".

This study of a very pertinent problem ought to be an unexceptionable contribution if special presumptions and the general appearances of scholarship, or publication under influential auspices, were guaranties. Actually the first of the four "parts" of the systematic exposition, tracing in four chapters (70 pp.) the "Antecedents of the Continental System" from 1660, though weighted by economic theorizing, has distinct values. But the very well-worked digest of traditional accounts of the course of the system (parts I.-II., 84 and 100 pp.) cannot be endorsed

for historicity nor for its specious theses. Also the comprehensive discussion of "Effects" (part IV.), although based, partly, on able recent researches, is neither consistent nor conclusive, as to data or deductions. Discriminating criticism implies specific corrections. Yet to control (with archival citations) the detailed sum of errors or misconceptions as to the evolution and workings of the Continental System—French, British, neutral—would require an extensive résumé of the reviewer's own monograph, *Napoleon's Navigation System* (New York, 1919). But as this was in Dr. Heckscher's hands (see his note on p. 219, also bibliography, p. 377), with data inaccessible otherwise (as he says), evidently in time for revision of patent errors before publication, then surely it will suffice to indicate here merely certain elemental faults of his study.

When in the preface to his English version Professor Heckscher says, naïvely, that if he had "had American readers principally in mind" he would "have either enlarged or omitted altogether" "the brief outline of American policy with regard to the Continental System" he does not merely confess an indulgent historical attitude, ready to warp the essential form or results of a research according to convenience of prospective readers. He also reveals a vital misconception of his basic problem, most incomprehensible on the part of one whose World War experience should have stressed the crucial significance of the neutral factor in every great conflict of land and sea power. This evidently explains not only the confessedly superficial—and inaccurate—handling of the American factor, but also the relatively disappointing treatment of the Scandinavian-Baltic problems. It is reflected, too, in the account of the Order in Council of January, 1807 (wrongly credited to Howick), and in the labored interpretation of the Berlin Decree as a desired "self-blockade"—with the incidental criticism of Mahan's views. A knowledge of the actual negotiations and expedients of 1807–1810 to escape real "self-blockade" is the corrective for such misconceptions. It gives the clue to the sale of French grain to England, so variously misconstrued by Dr. Heckscher. It is also the cure for the delusions that Napoleon's use of licenses was "the second great novelty which was introduced during the noteworthy year 1810" and that "the licensing system in Great Britain acquired its real importance by inveigling Napoleon into an imitation". Noteworthy the year 1810 was, in truth, but the crucial revampings of the Continental System are not explicable by the economic hypothesis of "fiscalism" as deduced from the Trianon—or other—tariff decrees. Economic hegemony, rather than more revenue, was the French objective of 1810, while "fiscalism" does not dominate Napoleon's policy until the "Grand System" of January, 1812, which is misconstrued, because of ignorance of the coincident secret "British surrender". For despite tradition, and despite all the logic of theories and statistics adduced to show that England could not have been seriously menaced by Napoleon's economic warfare, the evidence exists that the Continental System, and, for a time, its guinea-smuggling adjunct, like the American

Embargo, proved effectual coercive weapons. Psychology is often a potent determinant. For the Continental effects of the blockades available studies have supplied partial but typical data which Dr. Heckscher has marshalled effectively. But he has very disappointingly developed (10 pp.) that concluding Comparison with the Present Day, which was supposedly the primary justification of his monograph.

It is regrettable that the author's "hope that the leading ideas of the book, that is, the interpretation of the Continental System, will prove substantially correct" should be disappointed. Perhaps he should have regarded M. Dunan's 1913 warning (which he cites) that "the time has not yet come for general surveys of this gigantic undertaking". Certainly he has proved the futility of even the most systematic synthesis of the pre-war literature of the subject. While this limitation of his sources is partly explained by handicaps on research, yet surely excuses do not absolve from the responsibilities of historical research, unless economic surveys and Peace Publications are under a special dispensation. Moreover the systematic critical bibliography shows few vital omissions, and presumably these unused studies, as well as the all-important archival evidences, were as accessible to Swedish scholars in 1919–1921 as to Americans—and should not have been disregarded, even at the risk of delayed publication.

F. E. Melvin.

Ledru-Rollin and the Second French Republic. By Alvin R. Calman, Ph.D., Docteur de l'Université de Paris. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. CIII., no. 2.] (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1922. Pp. 452. $4.50.)

The Second Republic, as Mr. Calman justly observes, has had but slight treatment by English and American writers. This is no doubt due to its brevity and its failure. Yet 1848 is the turning-point in the history of modern Europe and the revolution of February is, for Mr. Renard, its historian, "la mère des révolutions". Mr. Calman has performed a service in extending our knowledge of this critical period and particularly of the rôle played by Ledru-Rollin, who was in some ways the most typical leader of the republic's first phase.

Ledru liked to think of himself as a reincarnated Jacobin of 1793, omitting from his programme only the policy of the guillotine. As such he stood half-way between Lamartine and Louis Blanc and was never a socialist, though he later played with the term. Universal suffrage and public employment of the unemployed, a progressive income tax, social reforms, and an executive subordinate to the legislature were the cardinal points of his internal programme, while his foreign policy, like that of 1792, contemplated the armed assistance of revolutions in other lands. Mr. Calman is very thorough in his exposition of these matters, especially the Roman question.

In his administration of the Department of the Interior, it is Ledru's relative conservatism that impresses Mr. Calman, notably in connection with the famous circulars and the character of the commissioners whom he sent into the provinces to replace the Orleanist prefects. The position seems generally sound, though the irritating effect of the earlier circulars, as well as that of March 12, is perhaps underestimated. The author rightly exculpates Ledru from complicity in any of the *journées* during 1848. His general denial that Ledru ever seriously considered a change in the make-up of the provisional government is less clearly proved. Seignobos, who has written the most recent history of the republic, believes that Ledru had such an idea, but was paralyzed by his hatred of Blanqui. Even Regnault, Ledru's chief of cabinet, thought so (p. 151). The point is probably incapable of absolute disproof.

One of the most original parts of the book is the demonstration of Cavaignac's tardiness in concentrating troops during the June uprising and the damaging effect of this disclosure on his candidacy for president. Ledru seems to have acted with promptness at that time. The general charge of vacillation, commonly made against him, is less happily handled. The author appears to admit it in his final summary, while denying it on specific occasions.

There are unfortunate evidences of careless proof-reading. "Provisional government" (p. 188) should read "executive commission"; "companions" (p. 207) should be "companies". "He resigned his seat, stating that the election had been based on universal suffrage" (p. 410) is incomprehensible. Mistakes in spelling are numerous.

Apart from such errors of detail, the book is a sound, scholarly piece of work, based on a large acquaintance with the sources and is undoubtedly our best study of Ledru-Rollin. The estimate of his character and services in the last chapter is particularly well done. There is a complete critical bibliography and an adequate index.

EUGENE N. CURTIS.

Garibaldi, Cavour, Verdi: Nuova Serie di Studi e Ricerche sulla Storia del Risorgimento. Con la Completa Bibliografia dell' Autore. Per ALESSANDRO LUZIO. (Turin: Fratelli Bocca. 1924. Pp. 727. 38 lire.)

THIS is a collection of Risorgimento studies of the first importance, based largely upon unpublished documents in the R. Archivio di Stato in Turin and other rich archives; it forms a companion volume to the writer's *Carlo Alberto e Giuseppe Mazzini*, issued by the same publishers a year earlier (reviewed in this journal, XXIX. 175), and like its predecessor it consists largely of articles previously printed in the popular review *La Lettura* and in the newspaper *Il Corriere della Sera*, both Milanese periodicals to which for many years Luzio has been a distinguished contributor on historical subjects.

The first study, entitled "I Primi Passi di Garibaldi in America", is the most important in the collection. It contains a remarkable group of unpublished documents from the Turin state archives upon Mazzini's relations with the Italian patriots who had established in South America branches of his secret political organizations, the Giovine Italia and the Giovine Europa. Like the leaders of the Fascisti today, Mazzini grounded his faith upon the youth of the country; he called upon *them* to make a United Italy—and it was by the youth, with personal courage and self-sacrifice, that Italy was made, some of them then as now being young in spirit rather than in years. This group of documents includes the manifesto of the South American periodical *Giovine Italia* published at Rio de Janeiro in 1836, a veritable "incunabulum of the Risorgimento"; the only known copy of the manifesto is that just discovered by Luzio in the R. Archivio di Stato in Turin. Together with this are several letters from South America addressed to Mazzini, 1834 to 1836, by the exiled Italian patriots, including one by Giuseppe Garibaldi dated January 27, 1836—a priceless treasure. The Mazzinian experts who edited the twenty-third volume of the monumental edition of Mazzini's *Scritti Editi ed Inediti* positively asserted (p. 97) that there had been no epistolary relations between Garibaldi the warrior and Mazzini the apostle prior to 1842. We are here carried back six years further. Support from Italians of South America did much to encourage Mazzini in his seemingly hopeless apostleship, and its importance is growing in history. In his long letter Garibaldi asserts his belief that not much more time will elapse before Italy will rise again. And he begs Mazzini to assume absolute functions of government and issue to him letters of marque with authorization to prey upon "the enemy's commerce", namely that of Austria and that of Sardinia. "Do not regard this project as chimerical", he adds, "for I believe that from the arrival of such letters will date the beginning of our arming."

Luzio's study upon "Thiers e l'Italia" is an exposition of Thiers's hatred of liberated Italy shown throughout his career and is based principally upon the Frenchman's papers published in Halévy's *Le Courrier de M. Thiers*. The studies "Il Milione di Fucili e la Spedizione dei Mille" and "La Spedizione Medici-Cosenz" are of the first importance for Garibaldi's campaign of 1860 in the Two Sicilies and contain many documents from the archives of the Million Rifles Fund. All three of these studies were previously published in *La Lettura*, the two last mentioned in 1910, the first in 1921. From this review are reprinted also "Il Pensiero Artistico e Politico di Giuseppe Verdi" (1901), containing many letters addressed by Verdi, 1861 to 1885, to his friend Opprandino Arrivabene, and "Garibaldi e la Marchesa Raimondi" (1920), in which Garibaldi's wife of an hour is defended. Some evidence is accumulating, though Luzio does not give it, that it was the Marchioness Raimondi who abandoned Garibaldi immediately after the marriage ceremony, and not

Garibaldi who abandoned the marchioness. To some of these studies new documents have been added since their publication in the review.

Other studies relate to the Bertani archives in the Museo del Risorgimento in Milano, to the Princess di Belgiojoso, to Marshal Haynau: one of particular importance, "Il Carteggio Nigra-Cavour", reprinted from the *Nuova Antologia* of 1920, contains four despatches of Nigra to Cavour, June 19 to July 14, 1860, referring to grave conversations with Napoleon III. and with Thouvenel. Nigra urges Cavour not to become uneasy over Garibaldi's political future: "Garibaldi is good only to destroy. When it comes to constructive work, it is to you, to you the master, that they must turn."

A valuable bibliography of Luzio's publications of the last quarter of a century upon the Risorgimento is appended, but in this, as in his individual works, Luzio makes a mystery as to where his various reprinted articles were originally printed. And why does he not give exact indications as to where each of the new documents which he quotes is to be found? And why cannot his publishers afford to pay for good subject-indexes?

At the end of the present volume Luzio utters a swan note to the effect that this is probably his last large work. We are glad to see that his publishers, in full contradiction to this, have inserted to face the frontispiece a list of new works which he has in preparation.

H. Nelson Gay.

The Triumph of Unarmed Forces (1914–1918): an Account of the Transactions by which Germany during the Great War was able to obtain Supplies prior to her Collapse under the Pressure of Economic Forces. By Rear-Admiral M. W. W. P. Consett, C. M. G., Naval Attaché in Scandinavia 1912–1919, Naval Adviser to the Supreme Council 1920, assisted by Captain O. H. Daniel, R. N. (London: Williams and Norgate. 1923. Pp. xxiv, 344. 15 s.)

No one during the war, not even the chief of the allied legations, knew as much about economic conditions in Scandinavia or what was happening on the North Sea, as Captain Consett, the British naval attaché to the Scandinavian legations. But his Foreign Office would not listen to him. The decisive economic battle of the war was fought in Scandinavia, England held the economic life of the three little countries in the palm of her hand, yet she remained blind to the situation until 1917 when Germany sealed her own doom by declaring unrestricted submarine warfare. Consett has told the whole truth as he saw it, and it is absolutely convincing. What he says should be carefully studied by every student of diplomacy, war, and economics.

Both the declarations of Paris (1856) and of London (1909) define maritime rights as framed for the protection of neutral commerce. Dur-

ing the World War, these declarations worked wholly to the advantage of German interests and were consequently incompatible with British. Owing to Germany's contempt for her moral obligations, England was forced to disregard the regulations as defined. To-day they no longer meet maritime warfare and must be revised for the benefit of the future.

Consett is most equitable in his discussion of America's attitude toward the British visit and search, blockade, and capture of enemy goods at sea, and finds it only natural that we would not acquiesce, to the injury of our interests, in allowing that principles to which the English had agreed in times of peace should be rejected because they did not like them in times of war. Beyond this, however, the root of the trouble was England's own extensive trading while the road was blocked to Americans.

What really happened in Scandinavia? Germany received tremendous assistance from Denmark and Sweden. In Norway matters differed, owing both to Norwegian sentiment and to British control.

Because of shipments from the Allies and their colonies, and principally English, Scandinavian merchants, where not fraudulently reshipping, were able to send substitutes or finished articles or food supplies to Germany, thus releasing German man-power and greatly adding to her sinews of war. Sweden became Germany's workshop and Denmark her larder. Both were tools of Germany, one passive and unresisting, the other a willing one. In 1915–1916 Germany was receiving 300,000 tons of Danish food a year, with the fats so necessary for the manufacture of explosives, as also hides. Sweden not only furnished the iron ore but manufactured munitions. She sent props and cement for the trenches, brass and copper for the guns and shells. Norwegian nitrates shipped to France were, on the other hand, invaluable to the Allied cause. Of shoes alone Sweden sent over 4,500,000 pairs. Shipments to Germany increased violently, while those to Britain decreased.

England in her blindness permitted matters to continue. By stopping coal shipments alone Sweden and Denmark could have been brought to terms. From the outbreak of the war up to 1917, Britain shipped between 21,000,000 and 22,000,000 tons of coal to Scandinavia, while Sweden was sending Germany three times the amount of copper she exported before the war. Britain's copper export to Sweden was doubled. The fodder sent to the Danish cattle resulted in a million of them being exported to Germany. The meeting at Malmö with the resulting prohibition of publication of all Scandinavian statistical reports should have shown what way the wind was blowing. Scandinavian threats of starvation or being forced into the war should never have been taken seriously. Owing to the profits their merchants were making, great quantities of food-stuffs were shipped to Germany, while home markets were empty. Forcing Scandinavia into the war would merely have robbed Germany of tremendous assistance. Germany's whole interest lay in retaining the *status quo*, an interest she concealed most admirably. The Allies were duped diplomatically. Britain was foolish and gullible.

Of course, Scandinavia would have suffered greatly by a strict British embargo—but better that than a prolongation of the struggle.

To every fair-minded American, Admiral Consett's frank statements in regard to Anglo-American attitude and relations should disarm much future distrust. In accomplishing this, the book has served nobly. It is a great and brave book on the economic aspects of the World War.

John A. Gade.

Le Jutland: Bataille Navale du 31 Mai 1916. Par Jacques Amet, Lieutenant de Vaisseau. (Paris: La Renaissance du Livre. [1923.] Pp. 144. 7.50 fr.)

What might be called a "staff history" of the battle of Jutland has not yet appeared, though we have several semi-popular books describing it, such as A. Hurd's *The Truth about Jutland*, Commander Gill's *What Happened at Jutland?*, and Commander Carlyon Bellairs's *The Battle of Jutland*, the latter frankly written in condemnation of the "cautious offensive" of Admiral Jellicoe. Lieutenant Amet's volume is a clear and interesting account of the only great fight of modern times between complete fleets on the high sea, based on the reports and books of the commanders engaged. The book by Oliver Guihéneuc, *La Bataille Navale du Jutland*, while fairly satisfactory in its way, was written before the accounts of Admirals Jellicoe, Beatty, and Scheer had appeared, and the work by Captain de Parseval bearing the same title is open to a like objection. In the preface to the present volume Admiral Lacaze praises Lieutenant Amet for maintaining clearness and accuracy, while not confusing his lay readers with too many technical terms. It is undoubtedly the best French account of the battle which has appeared.

While refraining from partizan criticism of the many phases of the action, several of which have been the subjects of bitter controversy, the author nevertheless frequently draws what seems to him to be the logical conclusion from actual events. Some of his remarks are very interesting. After describing the difficulties of scouting and intelligence with which the Germans were confronted, he says (p. 41), "The German fleet went out blindly, on the false supposition that the Grand Fleet was not at sea", etc. And again (p. 42), "It would therefore appear that Admiral Scheer was in too great haste to carry out his plan of operation for the immediate execution of which there was no military necessity". While giving full credit to Admiral Jellicoe's reasons, given in his book, *The Grand Fleet*, for his famous turn to the left, which tended to his losing contact with the enemy, our author quite evidently sympathizes with those who blame the British commander-in-chief, especially as the Germans were proving the better marksmen, for not seeking a nearer and decisive contact, in which his great numerical superiority could not have failed to be effective. Lieutenant Amet,

though sharing with other writers in his admiration for Sir David, now Earl, Beatty, nevertheless suggests that the commander of the British battle-cruisers was led all but too far into the trap set by Hipper, namely, the near proximity of the German main body, and that he was saved only by the timely appearance of the four *Barhams* under Evan-Thomas. He also shares in the general admiration for the quick-turning manoeuvre of the German divisions and entire fleet when danger threatened, and notes the fact, so characteristic of the German psychology, that, while the German fire was extraordinarily good during the first phases of the battle, it rapidly decreased in accuracy when the Germans discovered that their machine was not working as effectively, so far as whipping the enemy was concerned, as they had hoped, the British morale proving the more steadfast.

Lieutenant Amet questions the policy of Admiral Beatty in not securing the powerful aid of the heavy guns of the Fifth Battle Squadron when the battle-cruisers first met, pointing out that, after the signal from the *Lion* for all forces to turn S.S.E., Admiral Evan-Thomas continued for eight valuable minutes to proceed northward with his four *Barhams*, and did not steam toward the enemy until the receipt of Admiral Beatty's fourth signal. Our author finds it a "strange conception of commandment that the forces of Admiral Evan-Thomas were operating in liaison with those of Vice-Admiral Beatty, without being directly under the orders of the latter". "Thus, during all the manoeuvres preliminary to the battle, Admiral Evan-Thomas, from a point of pride which cost the English two battle-cruisers, refused to execute the general orders addressed to him by Vice-Admiral Beatty." In view of this conduct which our author attributes to Admiral Evan-Thomas, it is curious that he criticizes Sir David Beatty.

Lieutenant Amet, while praising the morale of the British, says: "After observing the passivity of the English squadron commanders during the combats during the day, have we the right to be surprised at the lack of initiative displayed by the English flotilla commanders? These attacked the enemy only when he cut their lines. . . . We cannot help noting with regret that this same spirit obtained throughout the British fleet. It was a spirit of defense and not offense." "The British were wrong to characterize the battle of Jutland as one of the most brilliant in their history. These exaggerations, necessary in war-time, have no sense today."

The author, like many, in fact most, other critics of the battle, finds it hard to reconcile the enormous superiority of the British fleet with the fact that Jellicoe drew off at nightfall, and at dawn was some eighty-five miles south of the battle-field, giving the Germans, who had been cut off from their bases, ample opportunity to regain them. "From this cautious measure an indecisive victory was bound to result." There can be no doubt that most naval experts believe, with Captain de Parseval, that "the English, in not going beyond justified risk, failed

to take the risk that was necessary ", namely, to gain a decisive victory; and also that they cannot agree with Lord Balfour and some others, that even a more complete tactical victory would not have gained for the Allies more advantage than Jellicoe gained by crippling the enemy while retaining the command of the seas. The destruction of the German fleet would have had a far-reaching, perhaps decisive, effect upon the result of the war. Morally the stroke would have been tremendous, whereas the actual result served to hearten the German nation and armies. The German mine-fields, no longer protected by guns, would have been swept up. The development of the submarines would have been greatly retarded, and they would have had to be used to a considerable extent to guard their own coast-line. This alone might have changed the course of the war. Allied sea communications with the Baltic ports would have been opened. Russia would have been saved to the Allied cause, and the German Baltic coast threatened. In Great Britain a large number of workers could have been withdrawn from naval activities and employed in army factories. As Commander Gill puts it, " A second Trafalgar on the day of Jutland would have crushed Germany's hope and brought Allied victory into view ". Commander Bellairs is far bitterer when he quotes Nelson to the effect that " the boldest measures are the safest: nothing great can be achieved without risk ", and then adds that " Jutland was a day of tremendous opportunity and monumental failure ". It is impossible to read the several accounts of the battle by British, American, German, and French naval experts without recognizing that this represents the general feeling among them. It is perhaps a significant thing that, while the British government has always stood loyally behind their commander-in-chief at Jutland, nevertheless Jellicoe has remained a viscount with a grant of £50,000 while Beatty was created an earl and presented with £100,000. Lieutenant Amet's excellent book is furnished with twenty illuminating diagrams of the different phases of the battle.

EDWARD BRECK.

The German Revolution, 1918–1919. By RALPH HASWELL LUTZ, Associate Professor of History. [Stanford University Publications, University Series, History, Economics, and Political Science, vol. I., no. 1.] (Stanford University, California: the University. 1922. Pp. 186. $2.00.)

THE author of this monograph collected his material in part while a member of the American Military Commission in Berlin in March and April, 1919, in part through researches in the rich collection of war material in the library of his university. He traverses the events of the revolution from the early attacks on the German internal front by the great general strike, staged under Independent Socialist leadership in January, 1918, down to the adoption of the national constitution at Weimar August

9, 1919. His narrative follows, in the main, a chronological order, and includes, as was inevitable, a running commentary on Germany's relation to the Allied powers and her economic situation. The whole is based on the study of a really vast amount of contemporary sources: daily papers and other periodicals; official documents; annals, such as the valuable issues of the *Deutscher Geschichtskalender*; and a surprisingly large number of the memoirs, *apologiae*, and pamphlets, personal and partizan, which swarmed from the German press after the armistice. The documentation from these sources is careful, and the quotations, though brief, are enlightening.

The two demands which will be made by the reader who seeks guidance through the tangle of happenings in the fateful eighteen months, perspective and relative completeness, Lutz makes an honest effort to meet. If he is only partially successful, the titanic nature of the events furnishes a valid excuse. The miscalculations and mistakes of the General Staff are stressed as opening the way for the revolution, and the fall of militaristic Germany is quite properly dated with Ludendorff's retirement, October 25, 1918. The author follows Erzberger, Prince Max, and most foreign observers in ascribing the final collapse of the internal front to the war policy of the army (p. 40). On the other hand, it is doubtful if many readers will agree that the continued support of the old imperial ministry on November 8 by the Majority Socialists was evidence of a "weak and vacillating" policy (p. 48). Here and elsewhere Lutz fails to give sufficient credit to men like Ebert and Scheidemann and Landsberg, conservatives whose controlling influence in the Executive Council was of such importance in holding the revolution within orderly bounds. The greatest omission is the failure to recognize the work of Noske, whose grim resoluteness made possible the "whiff of grapeshot" that halted anarchy in January and again in March, 1919. *Per contra*, few will agree with the author in ascribing "statesmanlike qualities" to Kurt Eisner. Lutz does not altogether avoid generalizations which in the necessary lack of perspective take on a journalistic character and detract from the objective tone of his narrative.

Any historian dealing with German affairs must take account of the relative space to be given to the various states of the Reich. It is unfortunate that the limits of the present work necessitated the omission of almost all details as to constitutional reconstruction in the smaller states. Even as regards the major steps toward the national constitution, the outline of events is quite too meagre to be of help to the student, omitting as it does all mention of such important preliminary conferences as those between the representatives of the Bundesstaaten in Berlin on November 25 and January 25, of such significance for national unity (*cf.* "Die Deutsche Revolution", in *Deutscher Geschichtskalender*, Heft I., pp. 58, 420, etc.). The date given for the elections to the constitutional convention, February 16, is probably a misprint (*cf.* p. 159).

All of this is material of critical importance. In addition to the admirable bibliography and useful index, a brief chronology would have been of great help.

As a preliminary narrative of events the work should be of use to the American student. Especially praiseworthy is the effort which Lutz makes to be fair to the high ideals of patriotism and democracy which marked the men who assisted at the birth hour of the republic.

ROBERT HERNDON FIFE.

Labour Supply and Regulation. By HUMBERT WOLFE. [Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, *Economic and Social History of the World War*, James T. Shotwell, General Editor.] (Oxford: Clarendon Press; London: Humphrey Milford. Pp. xiv, 422. 10 s. 6 d.)

THIS record of British labor in war-time is concerned with a narrower field than the title indicates. It is a history of state control, that is, of the efforts of Great Britain to adjust its labor supply to the needs of the essential industries during the war and to prescribe the terms under which production was carried on during the war.

The volume has two main sections, "Labour Supply" and "Labour Regulation", preceded by a brief introductory section and followed by appendixes containing the most important acts relating to labor which were passed during the war period. The section on labor supply shows the difficult position in which British industry, in particular the manufacture of munitions, was placed in the early days of the war through the loss of workers by enlistment. The government gradually worked out a remedy by limiting recruiting, first through the protection of munition factories as a whole and later by requiring a combing-out process, and also supplemented the supply by utilizing the labor of women, of foreigners, and of men released from the army.

The section on labor regulation is of necessity concerned with the subject-matter of the preceding section. It is the record of the experiments aimed at remedying the dearth of labor. These embraced the breaking-down of trade-union regulations for entrance to work and the substitution of the work of women and other unskilled labor (a process called "dilution"), the system which required "leaving certificates" of men who desired to give up munitions work, and the attempts to prevent trade disputes. State control was extended through the Munitions of War Act and the Treasury Agreement of 1915, to which separate chapters are devoted. The control of conditions of work by the Welfare Section of the Ministry of Munitions, the partial control of the wages of men, and the fuller control of the wages of women, are recognized as significant activities of the government in war-time and are given extended discussion.

The book will serve as a convenience for chronological reference work more nearly adequately than as a history of labor during these years. The author has been far too successful in achieving the purpose described in his preface, "to make this book impersonal and uncontroversial". In accomplishing it he has furnished a somewhat monotonous record, helpful in settling mooted questions of dates or government departments, but unilluminated by any revelation of the factors behind state action or by the attitude or response of labor. It is significant that no one of the labor leaders is represented in the list of names of officials whose assistance is acknowledged by the author. Help from such sources would have vivified the references to the Treasury Agreement of 1915 and to a dozen other important steps which fail to stand out in this account.

The *Economic and Social History of the War* for which the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace has made itself responsible cannot fail to be a record of great value, but the greatest contributions to its permanent usefulness will be those volumes which furnish explanations of bare official acts based on a more searching study of the contemporary social life of the period.

AMY HEWES.

BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

Bering's Voyages: an Account of the Efforts of the Russians to determine the Relation of Asia and America. By F. A. GOLDER. In two volumes. Volume I. *The Log Books and Official Reports of the First and Second Expeditions, 1725–1730 and 1733–1742.* (New York: American Geographical Society. 1922. Pp. x, 371. With vol. II., to appear soon, $8.00, to libraries $7.00.)

To the initiative of Peter the Great in 1718 are due the explorations which placed upon the chart for the first time approximate outlines of the northeast extreme of Asia, the Aleutian Islands, and a large part of extreme northwest America. These explorations were finally planned in January, 1725, hardly a month before Peter's death, and were ordered executed by his widow, the Empress Catherine, in the following February.

On the recommendations of the senate and the council of the Admiralty, Fleet Captain Vitus Bering was appointed to command the first expedition with the lieutenants Martin Spanberg and Alexis Chirikov as assistants. This expedition sailed from the Kamchatka River July 14, 1728, and explored the coast northward to Bering Strait, returning thence to their point of departure, which was reached on the second of September.

To resolve certain still unsettled questions a second expedition was decided upon, and under great difficulties organized and set sail from Petropavlovsk June 4, 1741, skirting the American coast from Cape Addington northward to Kayak Island, and thence westward, decimated by

scurvy, to Bering Island, where the commander died and from whence later the remnant of the party reached Kamchatka.

The details of these expeditions form the most important part of the early history of Alaska; various contributions to our knowledge of them had been made by survivors of the parties, but the official records remained unpublished. In 1892, at the instance of the reviewer, through the State Department, an unsuccessful attempt was made to obtain transcripts of Bering's log-books. Now, thanks to the unwearied activities of Mr. Golder and the co-operation of the American Geographical Society, the deficiency is supplied. The complete official records of the two expeditions, with numerous collateral data and reproductions of cognate sketches, as well as of original charts, are gathered in this very welcome volume.

The late Captain E. P. Bertholf of the U. S. Revenue Marine has made a useful contribution to the work by replotting the courses of the log on a modern chart, showing the tracks and landfalls of the vessels of the second expedition.

The volume is completed by a bibliography of the literature bearing on these explorations, and an account of the voluminous manuscript material in the archives of the Ministry of Marine, the Hydrographic Office, and other official collections at Petrograd, and that gathered by Joseph Nicolas Delisle in the Ministry of Marine at Paris.

These voyages were events of great importance. Their work was done at a tremendous cost of suffering and difficulty. The details of the endeavors of their leaders and personnel command respect and admiration for men who achieved so great an object with means so inadequate for such a purpose. Geographers and historians alike owe a debt of gratitude to the compiler of this record and to the society which has made it accessible to students.

William H. Dall.

Parties and Party Leaders. By Anson Daniel Morse, late Professor of History in Amherst College. With an Introduction by Dwight Whitney Morrow. [The Amherst Books.] (Boston: Marshall Jones Company. 1923. Pp. xlii, 267. $2.50.)

Professor Anson D. Morse was connected with Amherst College for fifty years. He died in 1916, just fifty years after his graduation from Amherst, in which institution of learning he was a teacher for most of his long and useful life. He was a great teacher as well as a careful and painstaking student. He made history the subject of his study, finding his chief interest in the study of American parties and party leadership. At intervals during more than thirty years of his academic life, he published a number of valuable essays in various journals on subjects relating to our party history, together with a few on economic and commercial subjects. In connection with the hundredth anniversary of Amherst College (1921) these essays were collected, edited, and published

by Mr. Dwight W. Morrow, as one of the *Amherst Books*. This is the volume under review—one of distinct value. Its publication is a service for which students of our party history will be grateful. Mr. Morrow's introduction is an able and interesting summary of the general history of parties, showing with intelligence and discrimination their place among the various devices for conducting representative government.

Though he published little during his lifetime in proportion to his knowledge, Professor Morse was known by those who had followed his work as an unusually thoughtful student and a judicious writer, one who sought to understand and to present the philosophy and significance of party periods, movements, and institutions. His judgments were always well founded. Here we have in this posthumous volume his well-known papers, "The Place of Party in the Political System", "What is a Party?", "The Natural History of Party", "The Politics of John Adams", "Causes and Consequences of the Party Revolution of 1800", "The Political Influence of Andrew Jackson", "The Whig Party", "Our Two Great Parties; their Origin and Tasks". There are other papers besides, all of them of merit and value. It is a great benefit and convenience to have them together in a single volume.

The volume cannot be said to present anything like a connected history, nor even a sketch of American parties. It contains suggestions of value, estimates, broad generalizations, and comparisons covering large periods of party history. It is not a narrative but a series of studies. Some of the essays were first published more than thirty years ago, none of them later than 1910. It is but a just tribute to say that they retain their interest and value; they will prove themselves of permanent importance. The essay on "The Cause of Secession", published in 1887, was an early attempt to give a fair-minded, impartial, historical accounting for disunion and war, but historical students will be likely to think that Professor Morse gave more weight to the conflicting theories about sovereignty than to the conflict of labor systems and material interests.

Professor Morse wrote with a sympathetic interest in parties. He believed in them, because he understood them as useful instruments of government. He indulged in no cynicism or tirade against parties. He saw their abuses, but he distinguished between their some-time unscrupulous agents and the real purpose and intention in party life. He held an even hand with a fine faculty of dissociating himself from partizan bias. It would be difficult for the partizan advocate to take exception to his judgments and conclusions. This is well illustrated in his paper on "Our Two Great Parties" (1891), a study which embraces in its reach party issues and influences from Washington to the younger Harrison.

These studies deal with political science and economics as well as with history. Students in these fields who are interested in Professor Morse's themes are recommended to his pages.

James A. Woodburn.

Revolutionary New England, 1691–1776. By JAMES TRUSLOW ADAMS, LL.D. (Boston: *Atlantic Monthly* Press. 1923. Pp. xiv, 469. $5.00.)

IN this volume, Mr. Adams has continued his interesting study of New England from the political readjustments following the English revolution of 1688 to the Declaration of Independence. As in the preceding volume, he follows the trend of recent scholarship away from the traditional historiography of Puritan New England, not only stressing the imperial connections of this section, but discussing those connections quite as much from the imperial as from the provincial point of view. The reaction from what Charles Francis Adams called the "filiopietistic" type of history is marked through both volumes, though Puritanism naturally receives less attention in the later than in the earlier periods.

Mr. Adams obviously does not like Puritans and, though his work as a whole is adequately documented, the relative amount of attention given to the unamiable aspects of the old régime is likely to mislead the uncritical "general reader", who is unfamiliar with the kind of material presented in the older books and may not need in these days quite so strong an antidote to Puritan prepossessions as the author supposes. Aside from concrete matters of fact, there is a persistent note of disparagement which sometimes suggests an emotional rather than a strictly scientific attitude. No doubt the New England clergy and laity were often "smugly" complacent and lacking in "genuine humility", but the author's picturesque and sweeping generalizations on this subject do not take other aspects of the record sufficiently into account, as, for instance, that painful self-questioning which is a familiar phase of the Puritan temperament.

At certain other points also the reaction from traditional views seems to carry the writer pretty far. Readers already familiar with the conventionally idealized accounts of the town meeting will find in Mr. Adams's side-lights on what he calls "that much vaunted New England institution" a valuable corrective; but he has nowhere given a well-rounded view of the old community life. No doubt the "Glorious Revolution of 1688" has lost much of its glamour at the hands of critical historians; but the series of sweeping generalizations on that subject (p. 7) is, taken as a whole, misleading. To speak of the régime which followed the Revolution settlement as a "middle class" "autocracy" is a questionable use of terms and hard to reconcile with the actual position of the landed aristocracy. In his treatment of the Loyalists, the author is in substantial agreement with the consensus of scholarly opinion at the present time; but his citations hardly offer sufficient evidence to support the statement (p. 449) that "during the war more colonials fought in the ranks of the British army than joined the American one".

These reservations should not of course prevent hearty recognition of the fact that this is a very able book and shows, in the opinion of the

reviewer, a distinct advance in workmanship over the preceding volume on the seventeenth century. There the author was dealing with a comparatively well-worked field in which he had the guidance of such men as Osgood, Beer, and Andrews; and his work, especially in the field of imperial relations, was in considerable part a popularization of theirs. In the eighteenth century, the author has indeed made extensive, and generally thorough, use of the best monographic material; but he has also worked independently through a great mass of documentary sources, both printed and manuscript. He has thrown new light on class-divisions in colonial society, and on the relation of "big business" to colonial expansion and provincial politics. He has skillfully developed the social and economic background of the Revolution and helped us to see more clearly than before the varied and complex situations which, in one locality and another, tended to produce a revolutionary state of mind. In short, he has given us a book which will long be indispensable to serious students of New England and of the American Revolution.

EVARTS B. GREENE.

The Causes and Character of the American Revolution. By H. E. EGERTON, Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford. (Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1923. Pp. vii, 207. 8s. 6d.)

IN eight chapters Mr. Egerton now publishes "the substance of some lectures" which he delivered as Beit Professor of Colonial History at Oxford. The work is based upon a knowledge of the most recent books and monographs, supplemented by a considerable investigation into the original sources. Mr. Egerton's judgments are his own, they are as far as possible removed from whatever is eccentric or startling, and anyone who expects an interpretation that squints toward Marx or Freud will be disappointed. Mr. Egerton's method seems to be rather to strike a judicious and common-sense balance between extreme theories. Thus he does not think, with Mrs. Schuyler van Rensselaer, that the Revolution inevitably began when the colonies began, nor does he think that it resulted from the indiscretion of Grenville in reading the American despatches. Inevitably no doubt, America being a new country separated from England by some thousands of miles, there gradually developed in the colonies and in England "two opposed theories of government and . . . two opposed types of character" very difficult to reconcile under any circumstances. No doubt Mr. Grenville read the despatches more meticulously than Walpole. Still the despatches were read before Mr. Grenville's time; and the true difficulty, before and after Mr. Grenville's time, was that the British government had really no consistent policy with respect to regulating the colonies. It should have meddled less, but when it did meddle it should have done so effectively. "Patience coupled with firmness was essential; whereas the English government was both impatient and weak." "Had almost any policy at all been adopted, instead of the

inglorious one of leaving for tomorrow what should be done today . . . the result might have been different." This inept substitution of a tendency to meddle in place of a policy was accentuated after 1763, at the very time when, from the British point of view, a coherent policy was most necessary, and, from the colonial point of view, least welcome. The result was that from 1763 to 1776 the opposed "types of character" became more sharply antagonistic and the opposed "theories of government" more rigidly defined and irreconcilable. Accordingly the two countries "drifted into war". The conflict was not strictly speaking "inevitable"; but its causes were partly remote, arising out of fundamental differences, and partly immediate, arising out of particular measures, such as the Stamp Act.

Mr. Egerton is aware that the conflict between the colonies and Great Britain was accompanied by a struggle within the colonies between the ruling aristocracies and the unfranchised. But I doubt if he is aware of the close connection between the two. One has only to read the works of John or Samuel Adams to realize that their bitterest animosities were directed, not against the British government, but against the Hutchinsons and the Olivers—the favorites of fortune who ruled the Massachusetts Bay colony. Such "new men", finding careers difficult or closed to them in the existing colonial régime, made much of the quarrel between the colonies and the mother country because they could thereby the more effectively blacken and hold up to scorn the motives and power of the Hutchinsons and Olivers. They could say, and did say, that it was really the Hutchinsons and Olivers that were at the bottom of the oppressive policy of Great Britain; British ministers were not so bad, or would not have been had they not been egged on by sycophants and placemen in the colonies. Doubtless there is very little truth in this. The Hutchinsons and Olivers wished to preserve their "rights" against Great Britain, to be sure; but they and their conservative friends would never, left to themselves, have made a revolution for their rights. Long before the breach they were more concerned to maintain their privileges at home than fearful of British oppression. It was the "new men" who pushed conservatives like Hutchinson into Loyalism and conservatives like Dickinson into revolution; and they did so quite as much because they wished to diminish the power and prestige of the local ruling aristocracies as because they wished to diminish the power of the British government. The Revolution was not merely a question of "home rule"; it was also a question of who should rule at home.

CARL BECKER.

Jay's Treaty: a Study in Commerce and Diplomacy. By SAMUEL FLAGG BEMIS, Ph.D., Professor of History, Whitman College. [Knights of Columbus Historical Series.] (New York: Macmillan Company. 1923. Pp. xvii, 388. $3.25.)

THIS essay, to the author of which was awarded a very substantial prize by the Knights of Columbus, in making a significant contribution

to American history sets a high standard which it may be hoped will be maintained in subsequent years and reflects credit upon the commission of award for its judgment and discernment. One is not inclined to cavil at its appraisal by Mr. Gaillard Hunt, who contributes an excellent introduction to the work, largely a supplement to it, as "an historical monograph which is not only a credit to American scholarship but a notable contribution to American history". As the title implies, it is a study in commerce and diplomacy. More than half the book is devoted to a re-examination of the grievances on both sides growing out of the non-execution of the treaty of peace, attention being directed largely to the questions of the Western country: the occupation of the border posts, the Indian difficulties, and the persistent activities of the British for the creation and maintenance of a buffer and neutral Indian area. These matters have heretofore been examined with minuteness, but Dr. Bemis has studied the Canadian archives and the British Foreign Office papers with great care and brings into strong relief the counter-activities of Simcoe and Wayne, checked by the agreement of Jay and Grenville to maintain the *status quo* during the negotiation which was to follow. That the positions fortified by the British were on the American side of the boundary the author adduces as a proof of the "prodigious ability of the peace negotiators of the United States" (p. 2), which would seem to ascribe to Adams, Franklin, and Jay a prevision of the value of the Great Lakes that they do not seem to have had. Discussing commerce between the United States and Great Britain between 1788 and 1794, the author concludes that during that period the United States was not only "the greatest single foreign purchaser of British exports but that the proportion of exports taken by that country was increasing steadily" (p. 34) save for the year 1792. These deductions are made from an examination of the papers of William Pitt, a summary taken therefrom being of special interest.

Turning to the pourparlers leading to the Jay negotiation, Hamilton assumes the principal rôle. His frequent and confidential conversations with Hammond, his early stand for neutrality as between France and Great Britain, his aid in the substantial ruining of the French cause in the United States, and the satisfaction of the British government with the way in which the neutrality policy was executed, are properly dwelt upon as furnishing a basis for Jay's instructions. These, largely the ideas of Hamilton, were recommendations only and, supplemented by Hamilton's communications to Jay, show the extent to which the Federalists were prepared to admit British contentions even "in the last resort, to preserve peace and national credit . . . [and] to acquiesce in a complete reversion or suspension of the liberal principles incorporated in the American treaties with France, Sweden, Holland, and Prussia" (p. 217). As these were trade matters largely, the statistical tables of trade 1786–1794 furnish an excuse if not a justification for the change. The same

remark may be made with reference to the policy of the United States toward the abortive armed neutrality of 1794. In reference to this the author here as elsewhere assigns to Hamilton an important part in laying the foundation of American isolation, the forerunner of the Monroe Doctrine. But in the *Federalist*, no. XI., Hamilton had already conceived of an "American system" and a "set of interests" distinct and separate from those of Europe.

To the negotiation proper between Jay and Grenville the space allotted seems rather meagre. The source-materials already printed are many and without going further might have afforded interesting light upon such topics as the principle of arbitral settlement and of extradition. Extremely valuable, however, is the printing for the first time of Grenville's proposals (appendix II.) and of Jay's Draft.

Of the reception of the treaty, the discussions in the Senate, and the attitude of the House of Representatives, little is said, but it was plainly not the author's purpose to enter into these matters which have so frequently been treated in histories of the period. The general conclusion of the author, that Jay's Treaty might more aptly be called Hamilton's Treaty and that it "served to postpone hostilities to another remove and to give the United States in the meantime an opportunity to develop in population and resources, and above all in consciousness of nationality" (p. 270), is one which will not be held to be novel, certainly not heterodox.

John Randolph of Roanoke, 1773–1833: a Biography based largely on New Material. By William Cabell Bruce. In two volumes. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1922. Pp. xii, 661; v, 804. $10.00.)

Mr. Bruce's two large volumes are based on exhaustive research into the sources of material bearing on John Randolph's life. He has unearthed many hitherto unused letters of John Randolph and has had the advantage of the counsel and assistance of many prominent Virginians in one way or another related to John Randolph.

Mr. Bruce's own ancestors came from Charlotte County, in which "Roanoke" is located, and he has therefore a strong local pride and an intimate local acquaintanceship which have been invaluable to him. He has undoubtedly written the life of John Randolph in the sense that no undertaking as large as Mr. Bruce's will be necessary again, and in the further sense that little opportunity is left for a subsequent biographer to discover new materials. However, there is still opportunity, indeed need, for a one-volume interpretation of John Randolph based on material which Mr. Bruce presents or reveals.

Mr. Bruce is most successful in describing the personal aspects of Randolph's life, but I cannot see that the author really enjoyed describing the political career of the "Southside Statesman". Such important

opportunities as the rise of political parties, the political cleavages in Virginia, the causes of the War of 1812, are neglected. Much space is given to extracts from Randolph's speeches in Congress. But little, if anything, is added to our understanding of public measures and happenings.

Among the best chapters in the work are the first four, on Birth and Ancestry, Childhood, Youth, and Early Manhood. Mr. Bruce feels a confidence here and a sense of making a real contribution, which indeed he does. He leaves nothing to be said on this phase of his hero's life and adds not a little to our understanding of John Randolph thereby. However, this portion of his work is marred by a seventeen-page narration of a scandal connected with the names of Randolph's two brothers and his unmarried sister-in-law, a scandal disgraceful and repulsive enough and unnecessary to give in full—too remotely connected with John Randolph to make necessary more than a reference. In the second volume twenty-four more pages are taken up with the same episode, chiefly a correspondence between John Randolph and the unhappy woman after she had become Mrs. Gouverneur Morris.

Mr. Bruce takes great delight in breaking lances with Henry Adams, who wrote so bitterly of John Randolph in the *American Statesman* series, and in a number of small points is able to overthrow the scholarly New Englander, carried away by his penchant for sharp rhetoric and his inherited hatred for Randolph as well as for many other Southern statesmen. For instance, when Mr. Adams says "he never saw, and never would have read, the *Pilgrim's Progress* or the *Saint's Rest*", etc., Mr. Bruce replies that "the only complete eighteenth-century edition of all Bunyan's works, including the *Pilgrim's Progress,* that the present writer has ever seen, has, for some seventy years or so, been in the possession of his family at the home about fifteen miles from Roanoke", etc., quotes Randolph as advising his niece to read *Pilgrim's Progress,* and refers to a list still preserved of the books owned by John Randolph, in which list is *Pilgrim's Progress.* Unfortunately, however, Mr. Bruce yields at times to the temptation to which Henry Adams succumbed and shows an unnecessary bitterness.

John Randolph's political career is well known. He entered Congress in December, 1799, immortalizing his candidacy by a famous debate at Charlotte Court-House with Patrick Henry. At the very first session he gave himself a character to which he was true to the end of his career. He favored the reduction of the standing army and attacked it in bitter terms—calling the regulars "a handful of ragamuffins" and in consequence getting into an immediate squabble. He had a chance in the House to vote for his kinsman Thomas Jefferson for President of the United States; and when the Republican landslide of 1800 had in 1801 resulted in putting Congress into the hands of the Republicans, Randolph became the head of the new Committee on Ways and Means—at the age of twenty-eight. This position he held for six years—until

his suicidal break with Jefferson and his assumption of the rôle of pure, original, holier-than-thou Republican as against such apostates as Jefferson and Madison and their deluded followers. He was in charge of much of the reforming legislation effected by the Jeffersonians. But he "chastised" the Yazoo claimants unfalteringly, opposed the compromise approved by the commission composed of three members of the President's Cabinet, "held up to scorn the House Committee on Claims, because it reached the same conclusion as they, and ignored the fact that the Yazoo claimants had not only won the general support of the Federalist members of the House but that of some of the most influential members of his own party, and that the whole tendency of his speeches was to affix a stigma to every man who countenanced the compromise in any manner or degree" (I. 198). Mr. Bruce correctly says that "the conduct of Randolph in this instance was magnificent; but it was not political leadership" (*ibid.*). After attempting such defense as is possible of Randolph's conduct in the Chase trial, the author says the whole truth cannot be told "without the admission that, to say the least, it added little or nothing to the reputation which he had acquired during the Sixth and Seventh Congresses and the earlier portion of the Eighth" (I. 214). But, despite this failure, Randolph always looked back "with supreme gratification . . . to Jefferson's first administration and to the position that he had occupied in connection with it" (I. 220).

It is impossible in this review to follow Mr. Bruce as he fully and carefully traces the reasons why Randolph broke with Jefferson; or to go with him as he traces the career of opposition to which Randolph doomed himself for the rest of his life—striking and startling as it often was.

Although in narrating the entertaining story of the "old Republican's" political career Mr. Bruce adds little that is new, as perhaps it was impossible for him to do, in the chapters descriptive of John Randolph's genius, personal qualities, and habits as a man he gives us an abundance of evidence whereby we may make sure what kind of person Randolph was. An orator of remarkable wit, at times of eloquence, whether speaking in legislative halls or on the hustings; of unmanageable temper, proceeding from constant ill-health, and a not infrequently unbalanced mind, carrying about him "a brooding fear of insanity" (II. 338); a lover of outdoors, of riding, horses, dogs; a rich planter, abounding in acres and slaves, but often ill-provided with funds; a reader of the best literature and possessor of a varied library from which he drew the classical quotations and references with which his speeches and letters abounded; a lover of children; a strange, erratic, ill-tempered man who squandered his abilities in profitless opposition, he nevertheless stands as brilliant, courageous, truthful, sincere, hating shams and subterfuges, and capable of courtesy, kindness, and real affection, which qualities soften the indictment against him from condemnation to pity.

Mr. Bruce's chapter on Randolph's District is admirably wrought out and is thoroughly informing.

The physical make-up of the work is good, the index almost sufficient, and the illustrations numerous and well chosen.

D. R. ANDERSON.

William Plumer's Memorandum of Proceedings in the United States Senate, 1803–1807. Edited by EVERETT SOMERVILLE BROWN, Ph.D., University of Michigan. [University of Michigan Publications.] (New York: Macmillan Company. 1923. Pp. ix, 673. $3.50.)

SENATOR PLUMER'S *Memorandum* is the most important political diary of the period that has appeared since that of William Maclay, which it much resembles in scope and character. The manuscript has already been used by Senator Beveridge, and by Dr. Brown in his *Constitutional History of the Louisiana Purchase*; and some extracts were printed in this *Review* (XXII. 340–364). The interest and value of the whole amply justify its publication in full.

William Plumer was a New Hampshire Federalist on whom a residence at Washington had a broadening effect. He went over to Republicanism at about the same time as John Quincy Adams. His *Memorandum*, so he assures us, was not written for posterity, but for his own use, as part of the material he was accumulating for a history of the United States, which never came off. Apart from the inclusion of a very long speech of his own, there seems to be no effort at self-glorification in the work; though, like all diaries, it cannot be deemed entirely "unconscious" as a source. Its value for historians lies first in the outlines of Senate debates, at a time when they were reported only occasionally in newspapers or in the *Annals of Congress*. Among interesting debates thus rescued from oblivion are those of March 3, 1804, on the Pickering impeachment, of January, 1805, on the Santo Domingo Bill, and of February 28, 1805, on the bill to grant Burr the franking privilege. The work is not merely a memorandum of debates, but a diary of life in the infant capital; and this part of it is not less valuable than the other. Plumer gives a much better rounded picture of Washington society under Jefferson than the somewhat romantic letters of Mrs. Samuel H. Smith, or the diary of Adams. We get a lifelike picture of bachelor society in the Congressional boarding-house; and, for high lights, the marital conflicts of the Turreaus, the outbursts of John Randolph, the visit of the Tunisian ambassador, presidential receptions where Indian chiefs rubbed elbows with European diplomats, and presidential dinners, where eight kinds of wine, including Tokay at a guinea a bottle, were dispensed. Several interesting conversations with the President are recorded, and Merry's reports of his slipshod attire confirmed. Manasseh Cutler told us of the mammoth cheese; here we learn of the mammoth loaf. The mystery of Samuel A. Otis's long continuance in office is cleared up: he gave the Senate printing to

Duane! In many such ways Plumer adds to our knowledge of the appearance, personalities, and politics of Jefferson's first administration.

The editing is done with great care and skill, although it would have helped the ready use of the book to have inserted dates in the running headlines. It is to be hoped that the book will be so favorably received that Dr. Brown will be encouraged to print some of Plumer's unpublished letters, which are preserved in Concord, New Hampshire.

S. E. Morison.

The Schism in the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1844: a Study of Slavery and Ecclesiastical Politics. By John Nelson Norwood, Ph.D., Professor of History in Alfred University. [Alfred University Studies, vol. I.] (Alfred, N. Y.: the University. 1923. Pp. 225. $2.00.)

American religious history, as we have frequently been told in recent years, is one of the neglected fields. With a few notable exceptions, the American church history which has been produced has been the work of the purely denominational writer, who too often has written from a strong partizan standpoint, while the so-called trained historian has to a greater or less degree ignored the subject. That the field is worthy of cultivation there can be no doubt, for it has already yielded most interesting and fruitful results. Within recent years, largely through the efforts of several university professors, certain graduate students have been set to work and a number of excellent studies—most of them doctor's dissertations—in American religious history have appeared. Examples of such studies are, Cleveland's *The Great Revival in the West, 1797–1805*, Maxson's *The Great Awakening in the Middle Colonies*, and deserving to take rank with these is Norwood's *The Schism in the Methodist Episcopal Church, 1844*.

Certainly no student of the American slavery controversy can hope to understand that momentous struggle if he ignores the part played in it by the American churches. Slavery was always much more than an economic question, indeed it had become by 1840, in the minds of many church people at the North, primarily a moral and religious question. In spite of this fact, until very recent years there has been no serious attempt to study slavery from the standpoint of the churches, and Mr. Norwood's study fills a gap too long overlooked. The slavery schism in the Methodist Episcopal Church is probably more instructive than in the other churches, because the Methodist church was more evenly established, north, east, south, and west, and also because that church had a strong national organization. For these reasons the Methodist church crisis was "the political crisis in miniature", but it was much more: it was undoubtedly one of the strong influences which hastened the political crisis. Men who are moved by deep feeling and strong conviction are not good compromisers, and for that reason the church schism came much earlier than the political crisis.

There was no lack of materials for this study, as Professor Norwood's twenty-four pages of bibliography and his copious foot-notes sufficiently indicate, and it is a kind of material little known and less utilized. The author shows that he thoroughly understands the complicated story which he attempts to tell and for a non-Methodist he has manifested remarkable accuracy in his use of Methodistic terms, while his whole attitude is that of the fair-minded and accurate scholar. Indeed the reading of this book by the leaders of the two great branches of Methodism might help those two bodies to-day to see "eye to eye".

The book is divided into seven chapters and has three appendixes, with bibliography and index and a map showing the Methodist conferences in 1844. After tracing the varying attitude of the church toward slavery to 1836, the author proceeds to describe the rising tide of agitation within the church until division becomes inevitable. Then follow accounts of the formation of the Methodist Church, South, the bitter border conflicts, and finally the contest over the division of the church property.

Aside from a few typographical errors, some minor omissions from the bibliography, and a slight inaccuracy in the map, there is little to criticize.

W. W. Sweet.

Jefferson Davis, Constitutionalist: his Letters, Papers, and Speeches. Collected and edited by Dunbar Rowland, LL.D. In ten volumes. (Jackson, Mississippi: Mississippi Department of Archives and History. 1923. $75.00.)

Jefferson Davis has been dead somewhat more that thirty years, his great cause failed nearly sixty years ago, and almost all the prominent figures of that epoch are no more. It is time an edition of the Davis letters and documents made appearance; and it is, perhaps, late enough in the history of the country for the appearance of such a work to meet with a hearty welcome, even by public men and "patriots".

Dunbar Rowland, director of the Mississippi Department of Archives and History, has undertaken to perform the task of collecting and editing the collection; and the work has been done with dignity and in good taste. There is an abundance of notes which give the main facts of the lives of all the prominent men who had a part in the struggle which Davis led. Some of these appear a little out of place, *i.e.*, some time after the first mention of the character described, but that is a small matter. Each volume carries a frontispiece in the form of a reproduction of a painting or photograph of Davis; and there are a few other illustrations, such as pictures of the two Confederate capitols. I must add that the mechanical part of the work is excellent and that there are only a few errors in the body of the text and these of no significance.

Of the value of the material offered there can be no doubt, although the reader can never be certain whether a given letter or document is now printed for the first time without reference to *The Rebellion Record*, which is not an easy work of reference, and which one does not ever have ready to hand. I feel, however, that it is a good thing to have this great body of material in one set of volumes, regardless of the question whether a great deal of it has been printed elsewhere.

Another query naturally arises, namely, whether there is not an equally great and valuable amount of material that remains unpublished and, as yet, unknown to the scholarship of the country. From the character of the material here presented, I am of the opinion that a vast amount of other such material still remains in hiding. What is here offered comes in the main from collections in the Confederate Museum at Richmond, in a similar storehouse of Confederate material in New Orleans, and in the Library of Congress. From the editor's notes one may not say which of these archives contains the greatest number of originals. The reticences of the great families of the old South have been such that one does not know where the larger bodies of Civil War material may be found. But the historian would search long for the Chesnut, the William Preston Johnston, the Drayton and Tarpley family papers before concluding any study that might be called final, even temporarily final. Nobody seems ever to have examined the Lee papers that were reported by Walter Page to be at West Point, Virginia, as late as 1907. The Joseph E. Johnston collection is supposed to be somewhere in Norfolk, although one would never look there for any intimate correspondence of the Confederate President!

It is all mere speculation to wander in this field and I desist in order to save a bit of space for notice of two other and more important subjects that naturally come to the mind of him who reads these volumes: the kind of man Davis was and the reason for the failure of the great adventure.

These letters and papers, reasonably exhaustive, utterly destroy the myth that Davis was a punctilious, exacting, and quarrelsome martinet. I, for one, would delight to stand by the side of Gamaliel Bradford, the Bostonese, as he reads these fresh testimonials of Jefferson Davis's character. He could not fail to warm a little as he read those letters of the earlier Davis presidency, letters of gentleness and persuasion and high patriotism. How could any head of a government say more gently than Davis said to Joseph E. Johnston: "Pray do not, if perchance wrong has been done you, make the matter of your rank in the army the cause of disaster to your country"? It was the same with Governor Brown of Georgia, Vance of North Carolina, and Beauregard, the morning star of the Confederacy.

Nowhere does the reader find in these volumes evidence of personal dislikes, arbitrary decisions, and favoritisms. To be sure there was Pemberton, the Philadelphia Quaker-general who quickly rose to high

command; but one needs only to read the record of Pemberton to conclude that it was not a matter personal to Davis that the Northern recruit was promoted. There was the case of Albert Sydney Johnston. Was he not a pet? Death on the field of Shiloh cut short that career so that no one may say how great a man he was; but few students of the old South now think that it was personal favoritism that gave Johnston the command of the second army of the Confederacy. And what shall one say of Lee? Davis picked Lee to take the most important position in the Confederacy in June, 1862; he chose Lee at a moment when "all men" spoke ill of him and he gave Lee rank and freedom of action hardly paralleled North or South during those eventful years. Pemberton was a friend of Davis; he failed. Albert Sydney Johnston was a friend of Davis; he likewise failed, giving his life in the failure. Lee was a pre-war friend of Davis in a peculiar fashion. Lee failed on two of the greatest occasions in American history. Yet Pemberton and Johnston were "favorites" in the popular parlance and, above all, in the imaginations of Joseph E. Johnston and Beauregard and Rhett and Yancey and Stephens and the brilliant, if reckless, John M. Daniel, chief of Confederate journalism. If Pemberton and Albert Johnston were "pets" then Lee must have been one.

These volumes do not sustain the charge. Davis showed every quality of character that one might envy in a high official or in a personal friend. Yet it will take a century for historians to accept the fact. And on another score, a word must be spared me. Davis did show real military gifts, not merely the soldier's outward show of things. His letters to Pemberton in April and May, 1863, evidence remarkable insight into critical problems that engineers and strategists will appreciate when they come to examine this correspondence. But Davis, a thousand miles away, did not order Pemberton, although it might have been better for the Confederacy if he had done so. The same and more must be said of the military part of the correspondence of Davis with Joseph E. Johnston at Jackson, where he idled and delayed until Grant and Sherman destroyed Pemberton. No historian who studies the facts and the record can fail to wonder why Pemberton and Johnston spent the four months preceding July 1, 1863, forty miles apart, thus allowing the Union forces to march down the Louisiana side of the Mississippi, cross the great river at high water, and then thrust their forces between the two Confederate leaders fifty miles north of Port Gibson! Whoever was responsible for the loss of Vicksburg, it was not Davis.

What has been said of the military alertness of Davis in pointing to the true policy of Johnston, who was superior to Pemberton, while on the Vicksburg terrain, must likewise be said of Bragg and later Johnston at Chattanooga and Dalton. Davis certainly did all that he could have been expected to do; nor were his advice and opinion amateurish or martinetish. As one studies the situations and reads Davis's letters one is forced to wonder what was the blinding cause of so much

stupidity in commanders who held the lives of scores of thousands of men in their hands and perhaps the fortunes of their country.

So much for the Davis character. Why did the Confederacy fail? By all the rules of history it should have been successful. About this subject there has been much discussion. Charles Francis Adams II. made it a part of the business of his active literary career to prove that the Confederacy was strangled by the blockade and the failure of Europe to intervene. But even that discerning historian omitted some of the very vital points of the query. Many Southerners have contended that the Confederacy was lost before it was born, that the great leaders of the movement knew it must fail when they organized it. That explanation hardly deserves consideration, except for the fact that many otherwise discerning men adhere to it. Mr. Rhodes simply insists that the superior numbers and larger resources of the North were the determining factors. Machines won the great conflict.

These are all well-known arguments and explanations. These ten volumes of the Davis papers make it plainer than ever that the Southern leaders expected to win. They regularly spoke of the movement as a revolution like that of 1776. Davis so described it. Lee had no hesitancy in calling himself a revolutionist. If Davis and Lee had felt they would be defeated, they would hardly have given evidence to Thaddeus Stevens and Charles Sumner for their treason trials. It was not until late in the war that Davis spoke of the struggle as different from that of Jefferson and Patrick Henry. After Gettysburg the greater leaders insisted on the legal right to set up a new government. Davis then spoke of the war as a fight for the Constitution; and Dr. Rowland has adopted this attitude for his subtitle. It was, however, none the less a revolution, whether its defeated leaders were to be counted traitors or not.

This very general attitude is adduced to show that Davis and Lee had no thought of failing at the beginning. Nor did Lee begin to talk the language of failure till after June 16, 1864. Certainly he did not think he would fail during the half-year that followed Gettysburg. The war might easily have been won after the midsummer of 1863.

What this correspondence shows most clearly is the ever-doubtful character of war as a wager among men. If Joseph E. Johnston had thought more of his country and less of his rank as a general, he might easily have beaten Grant before Vicksburg, and that would most probably have been a guaranty of final success. If Bragg had not been stupid after the battle of Chattanooga, Rosecrans would have been captured with all his men and equipment. That would probably have turned the tide in favor of the South. If Lee had not permitted Grant to cross the James River at City Point June 15 and 16, 1864, I think Lee would have won the struggle.

And at all these critical moments Davis was the one who seemed to see the broad significance of events. He warned Lee, June 9, that Grant would attempt to cross the James. There is no published evidence that

Lee gave serious attention to Davis's fears. Davis warned Bragg that he must not allow time to Lincoln, else he would lose the great opportunity of beating Rosecrans. And Davis was surely right in his estimates of the problem at Vicksburg.

Once more this correspondence tends to elevate the place in history of the President of the Confederacy; and it goes far to show that the Confederacy lost by the errors and mistakes of its great leaders.

William E. Dodd.

Jefferson Davis, President of the South. By H. J. Eckenrode. (New York: Macmillan Company. 1923. Pp. vii, 371. $2.50.)

Two veins interweave in this singular book. One is a vein of vehement dogmatism upon the subject of the "Nordic" race; the other an effort to tell the truth about Jefferson Davis. At one time Mr. Eckenrode is a rhapsodist; at other times a serious man. The rhapsodist holds that "Nordic" civilization is now doomed to speedy destruction because, in its last stand some seventy-five years ago, it was overwhelmed by industrialism. That last stand was nothing less than the attempt of the Southern states to establish an independent Confederacy. He further believes that the Confederate attempt might have succeeded had it not been directed by a mind which was inadequate; that, because it had Jefferson Davis for its leader, the South was defeated in "a conflict between Nordic and non-Nordic principles; between individualism and communism; between agriculture and industrialism; between democracy and aristocracy; between the world order of the past and that of the future". Goodness gracious! What horrible things have happened in this country within the memory of man. However, some of us—very dull, unimaginative people, doubtless—are like that Roman governor who turned away from the metaphysical Greeks with their speculative and interpretative quarrels, saying, "I care for none of these things". And when we find Mr. Eckenrode assuring us that "Wells has awakened the world to a sense of the reality of history", or talking with apparent seriousness about "that truly Nordic spirit, James K. Polk", or insisting that "Calhoun was almost the only great diplomat the United States has produced"—well, there is nothing for it but to bid the rhapsodist in him a glad farewell.

The other side is worth talking about. When Mr. Eckenrode can forget the Nordic race and the wickedness of democracy and the demnition bow-wows, and apply himself seriously to historical exposition, he is again the Eckenrode whose views, whether final or otherwise, are to be treated with respect. Perhaps he is too dogmatic. The reviewer, for one, is unable to accept a number of his conclusions. And it is unfortunate that he has chosen in this volume to present his interpretation unsupported by evidence. The book is practically undocumented. It has no argumentative notes. Evidently Mr. Eckenrode has set out to be "convincing" in the popular sense at all costs. And the rule for such

writing is positive assertion. All very well, if along with it, in notes or otherwise, there goes an accompaniment of analysis directed to the challenging student. After all, the subject of Davis, like most Confederate subjects, is still in the controversial stage. The data have not been sufficiently sifted, sufficiently analyzed, to have passed over into that stage where interpretation is all that remains. Frequently Mr. Eckenrode permits himself to treat a point that must still be regarded as open to question in a fashion typified by the following. Speaking of the fateful cabinet decision which ended in the orders to reduce Sumter, he says: "But Davis was in a position where further delay on his part would have been attributed to fear or indifference to the cause—was he not held by many to be a half-hearted secessionist?—and he decided on action." Of course this sentence does not say that Davis was an opportunist, playing politics, but such a meaning is contained in it in solution. Most students at the present moment are not aware of data that will justify such a comment. If this is interpretation pure and simple, the present stage of the discussion does not warrant putting forward such a view without assembling behind it the evidence upon which it is based.

There is far too much of this sort of presentation. For example, the whole episode of the formation of the Confederacy is based upon the assumption that the majority among the secessionists "favored Davis because they still hoped that it was possible to come to some terms with the United States Government, and they thought that Davis the compromiser would do all in his power to effect that desired consummation". Mr. Eckenrode is not, of course, the first person who has interpreted the facts to this result. However, students will expect him, when accepting such an interpretation, to argue the case and convince them of its soundness. Many similar instances of dogmatism without documentation could be cited.

Mr. Eckenrode has a formula of Davis with which all the facts of his life are forced to agree. He recites those unfortunate qualities in Davis with which all students are familiar, and uses as his refrain the assertion that Davis was "sensitive, vain, egotistical, open to flattery". His failures as a statesman are traced with disquieting frequency to these qualities alone. Mitigating circumstances are generally ignored. For example, Davis's acceptance of a defensive policy is presented as the natural outcome of his temperament, and no other explanations are allowed to come prominently into view. The possibility of a sincere theory with regard to this policy is not discussed; neither is any attention given to the problem of munitions; nor is there any adequate explanation of the reversal of this policy in the autumn of 1862.

In a word, the book is too "literary" in that popular but unfortunate meaning of the word, biographically speaking, which permits a writer to dominate his subject-matter by a formula. All over-formulistic biography fails eventually because sooner or later its people appear too

consistent, too abstract, inhuman. Here, in the attempt to make a Davis that will always be in harmony with himself, the author misses that element of the incalculable and the surprising which is in all men, and especially in all men of genius. Furthermore the interpretation is inconsistent with itself. We are earnestly assured that Davis was a great character, but nothing which he does here bears out the assurance. In action he hardly, if ever, escapes a tone of pettiness. In fact one might almost say that his author pursues him with vindictiveness, as if to avenge himself upon the man who, in his opinion, ruined the cause that might have been the redemption of the whole earth.

N. W. Stephenson.

A Life of George Westinghouse. By Henry G. Prout, C.E., A.M., LL.D. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1922. Pp. xiii, 375. $2.50.)

On the title-page the author quotes Carlyle's saying "the history of the world is the biography of great men" and at the end of the book, on page 320, says that "the life lived by Westinghouse was history". The intermediate pages prove his contention. He places George Westinghouse specifically in the category of those who advanced civilization through the development of the manufacture and transmission of power and the evolution of transportation, aligning him with Robert Fulton, George Stevenson, and Henry Bessemer.

The eminence of these men was however relative and subordinate to one who preceded them, and there were others who superseded them. James Watt was the pioneer in the manufacture of power, by the invention of the first practical steam-engine. Fulton added paddle-wheels and Stevenson added driving-wheels, adapting it to water and land transportation respectively. Bessemer had nothing to do with either the manufacture of power or the development of transportation. He was a metallurgist, but his process of making steel brought about through others an era of railroad and vessel building which made possible the full use of the locomotive and steamboat and carried the factory with its Watt engine to the site of the raw material, and industrial towns with their accompanying civilization sprang up all over the world. Then came John Ericsson, whose screw propeller superseded Fulton's paddle-wheels and extended water transportation to the ends of the earth. Westinghouse developed the Parsons steam turbine, which superseded Watt's engine for the manufacture of power. He developed Gaulard and Gibbs's system of alternating electric current and transmitted the power he manufactured to a distance. He first supplemented Stevenson's steam locomotive with his draft gear and air-brake and then displaced it by Sprague's electric motor. Then he supplemented Ericsson's propeller with the Melville-McAlpine reduction gear. Thus he extended vastly both land and water transportation.

Perhaps we shall soon see the concrete-asphalt highway, the rubber tire, and the Westinghouse shock-absorber eliminate Bessemer's steel

rail, and the internal combustion engine of Beau de Rochas supersede the turbine in both land and water transportation. Ericsson's screw propeller and de Rochas's oil engine were used by Zeppelin and the Wright brothers to bring about aerial transportation, the future of which no one can foretell.

So great actors come upon the stage and play their parts and already the cinema is teaching history by depicting their biographies. But although the masses in the future may not have to read, their daily news being furnished to them by radio, there must still be the patient recorder of the deeds of those great men, who leave no autobiographies, on whom the scenario writer and radio operator must depend for data. Therefore this author and this book.

An introductory chapter gives a running summary of what the author conceives to be salient features of George Westinghouse's career, in order that a clear conception and estimate of his character and the nature of his genius can be obtained at a glance. His career was full of dramatic episodes and some are recounted here, but others well known to his associates are omitted which would illuminate the picture of his subject which the author sketches, far more than thirty-six pages of appendix listing his patents and the injection of detailed technical description of apparatus, which the author acknowledges must try the patience of the reader.

One soon realizes that the accomplishments recorded were essentially not original inventions but adaptations of and improvements upon the previous inventions of others. This characteristic does not derogate from their merits, but indicates as the method of the working of Westinghouse's constructive genius the prompt recognition of the need for improvement and the seizing of implements already at hand for immediate purposes. Insufficient introduction of associates and an incomplete index indicate that the book was written more for contemporaries than for posterity.

Two biographies of George Westinghouse are now available in book form. Neither of them should be considered as final; later editions would improve them. The author of the present one says that Westinghouse will be better understood as the years go on. So he should have now, while those who knew him and his accomplishments are living, a complete and authoritative biography so interestingly written that future generations will come to know and properly evaluate his work.

H. F. J. Porter.

The American Livestock and Meat Industry. By Rudolf Alexander Clemen, M.A., Associate Editor, *The National Provisioner.* (New York: Ronald Press Company. 1923. Pp. ix, 872. $6.00.)

We need many books like this. The old industrial revolution has been studied and described in considerable detail, but the newer revolution,

which presupposes an adequate supply of railroads and an urban population, and which coincides with the rising use of electricity and the broad penetration of the factory method, has figured more prominently in social argument than in historical analysis. The historian has generally known too little of the technique of industry to do it justice; the economist has often been too busy with immediate analysis to be bothered with the laborious detail of historical investigation.

Mr. Clemen has unusual equipment. He shows everywhere an understanding of the methods of historical work and a knowledge of the sources. He is familiar with the current problems of the food industry, from the standpoint of trade journalism. He appreciates the value of the flood of detail that government control and war co-operation have brought about.

The book is not primarily a work of history, but its treatment of the theme of meat, of cattle "on the hoof", or "on the hook", allows about half its space to historical statement; and the analysis of the trade of to-day is invariably presented in historical terms. The first two sections of the volume are devoted to the rise of the industry; the last two to the problems of the moment.

Refrigeration is the starting-point for modern meat, and the period of pre-refrigeration is almost one of pre-history, so far as the packers are concerned. The raising, slaughtering, dressing, and distribution of meat, from the dawn of history to the invention of the refrigerator car, was unspecialized for most of the population. It took on a trade aspect for the United States only in the last few years before the Civil War. Its beginnings as an industry, like the beginnings of the labor movement, occur in the generation between Andrew Jackson and Abraham Lincoln.

The various factors which made an industry out of meat, and whose somewhat accidental coincidence fixed the date of emergence, are carefully described here. The national railroad net was fundamental. The city residents, collected by the factory, created the indispensable market. The ice machine and the refrigerator car were *sine qua non*. There was a vast speculative urge that came from the cow country accidentally born and creating while it endured a procession of cheap steers for the block.

At the moment when the industry was ready to appear, the United States, unconscious of impending change, was making large preparations to make the old order tolerable. The Union Stockyards of Chicago, opened at Christmas, 1865, were conceived and built merely to remove the stench of the old hit-or-miss butchering from the heart of the city, and to eliminate the droves of cattle from the city streets. To-day, says Mr. Clemen, the meat industry is "the largest industry in the United States". The meat products that gave it birth have changed in relative importance, for the packers to-day pay more for the live animal than the beef will bring. They have found their profits in the

by-products, and these are still producing new industries that fill the catalogue from glue to soap. The financial and shipping implications of the business have interlocked meat with the other giants of trade. Through Mr. Clemen's careful work, we may see how this came about. We shall understand the whole United States better when equally faithful studies have been made for steel and coal, clothing, automobiles, and transportation, and for the retail trade.

Frederic L. Paxson.

Industrial America in the World War: the Strategy behind the Line, 1917–1918. By Grosvenor B. Clarkson, late Director of the United States Council of National Defense. With an Introduction by Georges Clemenceau. (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company. 1923. Pp. xxiii, 573. $6.00.)

"Here is a good book", says ex-Premier Clemenceau in introducing Mr. Clarkson's volume. Most historians as well as most other readers will probably agree with this characterization, despite certain defects of spirit and of workmanship.

The book is essentially an account of the activities of the War Industries Board. While it is perhaps claiming a little too much to give the title *Industrial America in the World War* to a chronicle of this board, its work was unquestionably of enormous importance, especially toward the close. The author "was irresistibly impelled to this recital" because nowhere had there been adequate recognition of the service of the dollar-a-year men who performed the responsible work of the board. He disclaims "any special pleading for anything or anybody", but it was scarcely to be expected that one so closely associated with the men of the board should be able to view them and their accomplishments with entire detachment. On the other hand his position enables him to tell us much which no one outside could have known and to write with peculiar vividness.

The chapters of the book fall into three main groups—dealing respectively with the development of the War Industries Board, functional analysis of its activities, and analysis by commodities. In the opening chapters the writer emphasizes the unpreparedness of the country for war, especially from the standpoint of supplies and of organization for procuring them and for assuring their production. He stresses the lack of grasp of the broader industrial problems of war on the part of the War Department itself and the great part which civilians from the very start had to play in meeting them. He traces the origin and development of the Council of National Defense, the emergence and gradual increase of power of the War Industries Board, culminating in President Wilson's letter of March 4, 1918, which gave the final definition of powers and concentrated the board's authority in the hands of Mr. Baruch as chairman. The history is one of groping after an end not clearly conceived, but that, after all, was to be expected. In his fourth chapter,

Mr. Clarkson gives vivid personal sketches of the leading men in the War Industries Board; his enthusiasm for Mr. Baruch is high.

The functional analysis of the work of the board includes chapters on clearance, requirements and resources, priorities, balancing of supply and demand, price control, conservation, conversion of plants to war purposes, co-ordination of inter-allied purchases, and the foreign mission of the War Industries Board. Mr. Clarkson takes up the historical development of these different functions, the organization for and method of exercising each, and typical results secured. He points out that organization and methods were a gradual outgrowth of immediate circumstances and demands; that there was no formal scheme worked out in advance and applied rigidly. He emphasizes and approves the policy of the board in depending primarily on voluntary co-operation of the public rather than on compulsion, and believes it thus attained a success in the "disciplining of the nation" greater than that achieved in any other of the warring countries. He feels that the board wisely resisted the clamorous demands of the "for-God-sakers" who wanted to do everything at once and drastically; that it was wise, for example, in permitting most industries of a less essential character to continue in operation on a reduced scale, and in fixing flat prices such as to give a fair profit to the less efficient concerns, even though these prices meant for the more efficient concerns high profits.

Broadly speaking, in fact, our author finds little to condemn and much to praise in the policies of the board. He holds that the limitations of its achievements were due almost solely to lack of adequate power and lack of time to fully work out those policies before the armistice brought an end to the board's activities. It is doubtful whether any historian or economist will ever be able so thoroughly to examine and weigh the multitudinous phenomena of America's industrial life during the war—phenomena far more intricate than those at the front itself—as to reach a conclusive judgment regarding the work of the War Industries Board or of the other government organizations which had to do directly or indirectly with industry. There was no doubt a good deal of waste and inefficiency, but the present reviewer is inclined to agree with Mr. Clarkson's feeling that American industry accomplished under government leadership about all that could reasonably have been expected, in view of the novelty and the immensity of the demands.

In the latter part of the book the writer first describes the commodity sections of the board. Most of these were headed by unpaid workers drawn from the ranks of the industries concerned. While there were at the time and have since been complaints that some of these men at times unduly favored the interests of those industries, Mr. Clarkson is no doubt right in holding that only such men possessed the necessary expertness and that on the whole they loyally put the interests of the government first. There are very interesting chapters on steel ("an epic of the world war"), copper, brass, and other metals, nitrates, explosives, artificial dyes, lumber, leather, rubber, textiles, power and transporta-

tion, etc. Very naturally, in a field bristling with details, the writer has been compelled to select only outstanding features, but the selection has been very intelligently done.

The style of the book is breezy, in some cases running into exuberance, marked, for example, by rather overdrawn figures of speech. A certain lack of organization is evident and a decided tendency to repetition. The work is plainly not that of a critical historian. The writer has, however, not merely rendered a valuable historical service, but has preserved in popular form the lessons taught by our late experience as to the overwhelming importance of industry in warfare, the necessity of wide-reaching governmental interference with production and consumption in time of war, the dependence for success in economic control upon the whole-hearted co-operation of all classes of the population, and the huge waste which comes from lack of preparation.

Hispanic-American Relations with the United States. By WILLIAM SPENCE ROBERTSON, Professor of History in the University of Illinois. [Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.] (New York and London: Oxford University Press. 1923. Pp. xii, 470. $4.00.)

THIS book is the result of ripe historical scholarship, of a lifelong interest in and familiarity with the field of Latin American history, and of extended travel in the countries to which it relates. A careful reading with attention to the foot-note citations reveals the author's wide acquaintance with the literature of his subject, including collections of pertinent manuscripts, though a few books, for example, Lockey's *Pan-Americanism*, Latané's *United States and Latin America*, Stuart's *Latin America and the United States*, Akers's *South America*, Dawson's *South American Republics*, Shepherd's *Latin America*, Fortier and Ficklen's *Mexico and Central America*, and others are conspicuous because of their absence from his extensive bibliography. The absence of the first three might be excused because of their newness, but not of the others. Although not published until 1923 his book was practically completed in 1919, the author explains, and none of the events considered lie subsequent to the conclusion of the World War.

The author says that his book "may be designated as a series of studies about relations between the United States and the Hispanic-American nations". It is in no sense a complete history of the relations between the United States and the other American republics; but it does study in great detail some of the important phases of and episodes in the diplomatic relations of the American nations. However, equally important episodes and phases have been overlooked, or intentionally omitted, or possibly crowded out. The war between the United States and Mexico is dismissed with half of a sentence concluding with the comment "an event the consideration of which is ex-

cluded from the scope of this volume", which provokes the inquiry, why? His study of the interpretations and applications of the Monroe Doctrine starts with the French intervention in Mexico.

In commenting upon his use of certain terms he says: "As the residents of Hispanic America have as much right to consider themselves Americans as have citizens of the United States, I have aimed to refrain from using the term Americans exclusively for my own countrymen." The success with which he has lived up to his aim shows that the people of this country could, and the reviewer believes they should, dispense entirely with this bit of domineering egotism, which is sometimes conscious and sometimes unconscious on our part but always offensive to, though usually overlooked by, our sensitive but polite neighbors. Another term on his use of which he comments is the adjective Hispanic. In justification of his adoption of it he says that there has recently been shown a tendency to substitute it for the adjective Latin, generally used heretofore to denote the nations of America which owe their origin to the Latin countries of Europe. The reviewer disapproves the author's choice in this regard quite as heartily as he approves the author's use of the adjective American. To a Brazilian the term Hispanic America excludes his own country and means the same as Spanish America, the two English adjectives being translated into the same Portuguese adjective, which resembles *Hispanic* much more closely than it does *Spanish*. The reviewer admits with regret that, as the author says, there has recently been shown by some students of history in the United States a growing tendency to adopt the less used, less desirable term; but that this tendency is marked he does not concede. He hopes and believes it will prove to have been a short-lived fad. The term Latin America is capable of misinterpretation with reference to its inclusion or exclusion; but it is less erroneous than Hispanic America and carries with it no offense or national slight, or implication, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that the user is ignorant of the fact that Brazil is not a Spanish country. The fact emphasized by advocates of the use of the term Hispanic that it is derived from the Latin name Hispania, which was applied to the region now occupied by both Spain and Portugal, explains but does not justify their choice. The value of Dr. Robertson's book is of course not seriously impaired by his adoption of this term.

William R. Manning.

MINOR NOTICES

Annual Report of the American Historical Association for the Year 1919. (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1923, pp. 486.) Every reader's first thought on receiving this volume will be, how extraordinary that this, almost the only historical publication of the United States government, should be so delayed in the Government Printing Office that it appears four years after the meeting whose transactions it reports. That

establishment is the greatest printery in the world. It can turn out to-morrow morning, in full printed form, the record of every word spoken to-day in six hours of windy debate in the Capitol. It can do this because Congress chooses that it shall. It can not catch up with these annual volumes of history because the Congress of this rich country, spending less on the records of the past than little Belgium or impoverished Germany, does not care to have it do so. Meanwhile there results to the historical scholars of the country great inconvenience from not receiving the record, and great diminution of its value when received. Of the present volume, one third presents the formal record of the doings of the society and its committees and other subsidiary organizations at that far-off meeting in Cleveland in December, 1919. Another third is occupied with a very impressive record and survey of the activities in the field of history, by men and organizations, during the World War. To this survey, edited by Dr. Newton D. Mereness, the official heads of the historical bureaux in the Departments of War, Navy, and State have contributed records of their programmes, and of the small achievements to which the parsimonious Congress has confined them, achievements contrasting pitifully with the great official war-histories of the British and the French. The work of the National Board for Historical Service is set forth, fully and intelligently, by its secretary, Mr. Waldo G. Leland. Then follow accounts, usually supplied by the official in charge, of the work done in each state by the organs established for the purpose of recording the war-history of the state during the years 1917–1919. The future historian will surely find this whole record useful, and the present-day member of the historical profession may well recur to its pages with gratification. In the last third of the volume, half a dozen of the papers read at the Cleveland meeting, and described in our report of it (XXV. 369–390), are printed in full. The volume closes with the contributions made by the Agricultural History Society, of which the chief concern tobacco history, that of maize, and the earliest American book on kitchen gardening, and are respectively by George K. Holmes, G. N. Collins, and Marjorie F. Warner, all of the Department of Agriculture.

Man's Prehistoric Past. By Harris Hawthorne Wilder, Ph.D., Professor of Zoology, Smith College. (New York, Macmillan Company, 1923, pp. xiv, 463, $5.00.) Professor Wilder is well known among zoologists for his work on amphibia and his *History of the Human Body*. The present work is intended to be an outline of prehistory, in which the story of human development in all parts of the world is condensed in one volume of four hundred and fifty pages—no easy task.

It opens with a very brief sketch of our prehuman ancestors during tertiary times, of conditions during the glacial period, and of the work of ice and water in molding our continents. The second chapter describes the materials on which the study is based; the remains found in rock-shelters and caverns; in kitchen-middings, huts, and lake-dwellings, in graves and burial chambers, together with interesting discussions of

prehistoric houses, towns, and cities. Among these we notice the discovery by the author of prehistoric corn-fields in New England! The whole range of European prehistory is surveyed in about one hundred and fifty pages forming the third chapter. The chronological table (opposite p. 138) is an excellent piece of most difficult work, showing periods, dates, races, and conditions of late tertiary and early quaternary times. The brief discussion of the much debated eolith question is cautious and wise. The description of the development of the stone axe, of the introduction of metals, of the slow changes in material, form, finish, and use of implements and ornaments is clear and instructive. The changes "march" before us. But the necessary extreme condensation compels us to read slowly, and stimulates questioning and desire for more information and explanation. This difficulty is partially met by a few brief bibliographic notes on the most important topics. We wish that they were more numerous; or, better, that a complete, well-classified bibliography for each chapter might have been added at the end of the volume.

The Prehistory of the Two Americas is treated in a chapter of about one hundred pages. Here exploration and investigation are less advanced and the author's task is lighter. He gives an admirable view of recent results. The book closes with a chapter on the Known Types of Prehistoric Man; Heidelberg and Piltdown man and Pithecanthropus are well described and compared.

The book contains over one hundred illustrations. The proof-reading was somewhat hurried—see the first four lines of page 58, and elsewhere *passim*. The author has given us a very readable and useful introduction to a vast, important, and comparatively new field of study. It should be expanded to furnish space for adequate treatment of the prehistory of Asia and of other topics. We need sadly a book like Déchelette's *Manuel d'Archéologie*, for which the present volume contains framework and much substance. Why cannot Professor Wilder give it to us?

Warfare by Land and Sea. By Eugene S. McCartney, University of Michigan. (Boston, Marshall Jones Company, 1923, pp. xix, 206, $1.50.) Dr. McCartney's book, no. 33 of the series *Our Debt to Greece and Rome*, aims to set forth in non-technical language the achievements of the Greeks and Romans in military science, particularly in those aspects of it in which they anticipated, or have taught and inspired, modern peoples. While not being a military history and containing little that is new, it is agreeably written and shows good judgment in its estimate of the important contributions of these two peoples to the art of war. The more significant of the contributions are: the evolution of generalship, the development of army organization, the invention of "artillery", tactical and strategic manoeuvres, the use of cavalry, the development of drill and discipline, and the realization of the value of

sea power. The topical arrangement of his material has led the author at times to make unnecessary repetitions, as, for example, the two citations of Livy's opinion of Hannibal, pages 113 and 127. A more careful revision would have eliminated these and corrected the statement that "ancient counterparts of this contrivance [the tank] are found in the sheds or mantlets and towers mounted on wheels, and even on [*sic*!] Assyrian reliefs". Incidentally, the reviewer cannot agree that these were true counterparts of tanks, or that the use of siege towers offers a true analogy to the use of airplanes. A few corrections seem in order. To speak of Marathon as a victory over "the lash-driven hordes of a military despotism" savors of empty rhetoric (in spite of Colonel Naylor's approval in his introduction), since we know nothing of the numbers and little of the composition of the Persian army in that battle. The introduction of pay for the Roman soldiers at the siege of Veii did not transform them into a "standing professional army". And the date given on pages 115 and 116 for Hannibal's crossing of the Rhone and operation in North Italy should be 218, not 219, B. C. One misses any satisfactory discussion of the problem of raising and maintaining armies. The book contains several good illustrations and a selected bibliography, which, however, fails to cite any recent history of Greece or Rome.

A History of Hindu Political Theories from the Earliest Times to the End of the First Quarter of the Seventeenth Century A. D. By U. Ghoshal, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of History, Presidency College, Calcutta. (London and Calcutta, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1923, pp. xiv, 296, 11 s. 6 d.) It used to be said that the Hindus had no political history, and no interest in political science. The discovery, in the first decade of this century, of the Kautiliya Arthaçâstra, the oldest and most important of Hindu text-books on polity, has done much to dispel that illusion. Even without that book, there is abundant evidence of interest in practical statecraft in ancient India. It must, however, be admitted that practical statecraft interested the Hindus much more than political theory. We search in vain for any comprehensive, unified, systematic attempt to construct a theory of the state, comparable on the one hand with Western political philosophies, and on the other hand with the cosmo-religious philosophies of India. Yet we do find, all in all, many tentative, if abortive, starts toward such theories. It was certainly worth while to collect all such stray hints within the covers of one book. This has been done, on the whole very adequately, in the book under review. The author is well trained in both Hindu and Occidental learning. He criticizes sanely the comparisons that have been made between Western political theories and those of India; his attitude toward such comparisons is, generally speaking, reserved, or even skeptical. The so-called "social compact" theory of the origin of the state, as it appears in India, is shown to be only superficially similar to its

Western analogue. And so with other theories, such as the "divine right of kings"; the differences between India and the West are perhaps more profound than the resemblances.

The book can be recommended to Western students of political theory as a sane interpretation, from the historical and comparative standpoint, of what the ancient Hindus accomplished in that field. Only the chapter on the First Phase, from the Rigveda to the Upanishads, seems to the reviewer less successful. The Vedic evidence adduced hardly proves that kings were held to be "divine", but is rather merely one phase of the far-reaching parallelism between the heavenly and earthly societies which the Vedic authors assumed. Earthly kings were compared or identified not with *gods* generically, but with certain specific gods who were *king-gods*, that is, whose relation to the other gods was conceived to be the same as the relation of earthly kings to other men.

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

Life on a Mediaeval Barony: a Picture of a Typical Feudal Community in the Thirteenth Century. By William Stearns Davis, Ph.D., Professor of History in the University of Minnesota. (New York and London, Harper and Brothers, 1923, pp. xiv, 414, $3.50.) "To make the life of the Middle Ages live again in its pageantry and its squalor, its superstition and its triumph of Christian art and love, is the object of this study." The author endeavors to accomplish this purpose by describing an imaginary barony in northern France of the year 1220, "for this little world by itself is a cross section, as it were, of a great part of France, nay, of all feudal Europe". This "cross section" begins with the life of the castle and ends with that of the cathedral, with the activities of field and forest, monastery and town, in between. The book is a survey of the most typical customs and conditions of medieval society, and the descriptions are always interesting and entertaining.

In doing all this, the author has given his book a dual character. The general plan is that of a manual. The chapters have been arranged so as to cover medieval life in all its phases. Throughout the text, heavy type has been used for unfamiliar terms and for emphasis. The book is illustrated and has an adequate index. However, the author also seeks to entice the reader by weaving a story into this comprehensive framework. It is true that the original plan restricts the activity of the characters and prevents the development of a plot, but the pretext of a story at least furnishes the author with a literary device which enables him to escape the more exacting and precise demands of a manual. The barony of St. Aliquis in the duchy of Quelqueparte, not far from Burgundy, Champagne, or Paris, is only typical of its kind, but is made very real, because it has been constructed from the most interesting fragments of many actual feudal states.

Perhaps too much attention has been given to "pageantry", for more than half of the book is devoted to the military class. It is unfortunate

that the legend of the year 1000 has been given longer popular life (p. 288). Gautier's *La Chevalerie* appears in the preface as *Le Chivalrie*. In general the work is trustworthy, for it is based on the best secondary works and contains many excellent quotations or adaptations from the sources. It presents a reliable picture of the Middle Ages which will be interesting to the general reader and useful to the teacher.

FREDERIC DUNCALF.

City Government of Winchester; from the Records of the XIV. and XV. Centuries. By J. S. Furley, M.A. (Oxford, Clarendon Press; New York, Oxford University Press, 1923, pp. 196, 14 s.) This volume meets, in part at least, the need that has long existed for a good account of the municipal history of Winchester in the Middle Ages. The standard history of this city by John Milner, first published in 1798, is chiefly valuable for its appendix of town charters, while the account given of Winchester in the *Historic Towns* series (1890) is brief and popular. Previous to the appearance of this volume by Mr. Furley, the best account of Winchester was that in the *Victoria Counties History* for Hampshire. Special contributions to the history of the city had been made by various writers, but no comprehensive account of its constitution and government had appeared.

Mr. Furley uses both a chronological and a topical method of presenting his material. The first three of his eleven chapters are chronological and deal with the development of the city or borough to the middle of the fourteenth century, when, as the author observes, "we may consider the city to have come of age". The remaining eight chapters are topical and treat interestingly of the city officers and commonalty, the merchant gild and the craft gilds, the relations of Winchester with its ecclesiastical neighbors, taxation and civic expenditures, the courts of the city, and the medieval townsman. Facsimiles of Winchester records and reprints of city usages, charters, account rolls, and other documents form a useful appendix to the text.

Although of great value to students of English municipal history, this volume indicates a lack of broad scholarship on the part of the author. Among other omissions, no citations are given to the works of Charles Gross, one of the real authorities on English municipal history, and the list of books used as given at the end of the volume is a somewhat inadequate one, even in regard to Winchester itself. Intrinsically, however, the volume is sound and scholarly, and Mr. Furley has made a real contribution to English municipal history.

N. M. TRENHOLME.

Les Sources et le Développement du Rationalisme dans la Littérature Française de la Renaissance (1533–1601). Par Henri Busson, Docteur ès Lettres. [Bibliothèque de la Société d'Histoire Ecclésiastique de la France.] (Paris, Letouzey et Ané, 1922, pp. xvii, 685.) The interest

of students of the French Renaissance has, in recent years, been almost as much drawn to its learned as to its imaginative aspects. Especially has the application of the historical method to literature and the study of the evolution of ideas directed attention to the intellectual background of a scholarly age. Hence the importance given to humanism by writers like Plattard and Renaudet, etc. The present volume deals with tendencies of thought hitherto not thoroughly traced, except perhaps in such a work as Charbonnel's *La Pensée Italienne au XVI^e Siècle et le Courant Libertin* (1919), which it does not duplicate, even for France, inasmuch as it deals mainly with a somewhat earlier period. Both books, however, pursue the common task of following upstream the study of French theological and literary rationalism.

Historians tracing the ancestry of the French seventeenth-century "libertine" rationalists have usually been satisfied to begin with Montaigne in the sixteenth. In the books of Busson and Charbonnel the filiation is carried back to the Paduan Averroists and to Pomponazzi. The philosophical Platonism of the Renaissance is partly displaced as the source of rationalism. Aristotle is split in twain and he becomes the cause of rationalism, after having been the chief supporter of the Church. Meanwhile humanism, by vulgarizing ancient literature and philosophy, gave thinkers a bias toward rationalism in place of blind faith. The opposition drawn by the Paduans between faith and reason became the source of sixteenth-century rationalism and of seventeenth-century "libertinism".

It is to the task of tracing the various manifestations of the new tendency that M. Busson devotes his elaborate work. He thinks, in spite of Lecky, that the question of immortality is more important in the history of rationalism than that of miracles. With undaunted energy and, to all appearances, thoroughness he has analyzed the works of early Frenchmen in Italy and of Italians in France, especially among the theologians and humanists, who dissevered faith and reason. After 1553 the reader encounters more frequently the names of French poets and prose writers.

The work is one of complete scholarship and is dispassionate, even though followed by a sectarian *nihil obstat* and *imprimatur*. The notes and bibliographies will prove valuable for reference, in spite of some carelessness in names and titles. For instance, Lecky's study is constantly referred to as *Rising of Rationalism*.

C. H. C. WRIGHT.

Tabeller over Skibsfart og Varetransport gennem Öresund, 1497–1660. Udarbejdede efter de bevarede Regnskaber over Öresundstolden. Udgivne paa Carlsbergfondets Bekostning ved Nina Ellinger Bang. Förste Del: *Tabeller over Skibsfarten.* Anden Del: *Tabeller over Varetransporten.* (Copenhagen, Gyldendal, 1906, 1922, pp. x, 404; xii, 620.) In 1906 Mrs. Bang published her first quarto volume on Baltic trade, en-

titled *Tables of Navigation and Transportation of Merchandise through the Sound*. Although the Sound tolls, levied and collected by Denmark on ships entering and leaving the Baltic, covered the long period from about 1429 to 1857, approximately only a century of their history is presented here; but that century is one of the most interesting parts of the whole period. Although the earliest document in the first volume is dated 1497, it is only from 1562 that the accounts are continuous. In this first volume we find data concerning shipping—nationality, capacity, and port of departure. For about half a century before 1597 we observe a gradual increase in the number of ships passing through the Sound; thence for about the same length of time we see a gradual decline.

After the lapse of sixteen years the second volume (1562–1657) has appeared. This one provides us with data concerning the cargoes themselves—the kind of goods, amount, whether going eastward or westward, nationality of the cargo, and presumptive destination. The data are not presented in all their detail, but classified under significant headings—clapboards, rye, salt, tin, textiles. Then in notes the nature of some particular items is set forth, whether the cloth is brocade, fustian, or damask. In spite of the fact that the work is written in Danish, it is made accessible to those not acquainted with that language, by two simple devices. One is the translation of the introductions into French, printed alongside of the Danish; and the other, the polyglot index to the second volume, with its French, German, and English equivalents.

We may well regret the failure of the editor to give us some sample pages of the Sound books, even though we are grateful for the enormous amount of synopsizing and compression which she has done. We are glad to get precise data as to the predominance of the Dutch and the insignificance of the French in the Baltic trade, while we lament the lack of adequate information about Scandinavian trade exempt from tolls. We may feel very uncertain about the assumption that the destination of a return cargo is the home port, but there seems to be no help for it. We may regret that the work ends for the present with 1657, and that for the later period we have not even the totals, which might be given with relative ease; still we are thankful for what is provided, and appeased with the promise of a forthcoming volume on the period up to 1783. We may at times feel that in the continued collection of such masses of historical data there are diminishing returns, as far as general knowledge is concerned; nevertheless we cannot fail to appreciate the significance of particular bits of information about individual countries. For the unending process of rewriting economic history, for the continuous task of refining evidence and revising judgment, Mrs. Bang has performed an invaluable service.

N. S. B. Gras.

Dictionnaire des Institutions de la France aux XVII^e et XVIII^e Siècles. Par Marcel Marion, Professeur au Collège de France. (Paris,

Auguste Picard, 1923, pp. ix, 564, 35 fr.) There was great need for such a volume as M. Marion has prepared. The *Dictionnaire des Institutions, Mœurs, et Coutumes de la France* by Chéruel, published in 1855, excellent at the time of its appearance, is quite inadequate to-day and never was satisfactory for the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries of French history. The task undertaken by M. Marion was much less ambitious than that of Chéruel; he limited himself to the two centuries that properly constitute the *ancien régime* and "systematically left to one side all that concerns manners and customs, devoting himself entirely to the institutions". M. Marion has characterized his volume as "un ouvrage de vulgarisation, qui n'a jamais visé qu'à répandre quelques idées justes et quelques notions exactes, dût-il encourir le reproche d'-être trop élémentaire et trop incomplet". That the work should be elementary and incomplete was inevitable, for it is a dictionary in which some 1500 terms, arranged in alphabetical order, are defined, at greater or less length, in 562 double-column pages. Many terms are disposed of in a paragraph or even in a sentence, some receive a column or a page, while in only about thirty cases are more than two pages devoted to the description of an institution. The limitations of space made it impossible to trace the history of an institution, and if it underwent important changes, it was described as it existed on the eve of the Revolution. The limitation of space likewise made frequent and detailed bibliographical references impossible and only the longer articles are supplied with a brief but well-chosen bibliography. But although the longest articles do not carry one far in the study of the institutions of the *ancien régime*—satisfactory as they are within the limits placed upon the writer by the nature of his task—and although the scholar *au courant* with the latest literature will find little that is new in the description of the institutions that have been the object of his study, he will find, however, in regard to institutions lying outside the field of his investigations, that M. Marion's "idées justes et notions exactes" are very helpful in getting *orientiert* and that a vast amount of exact information concerning the institutions of France during the *ancien régime* has been packed into these five hundred and sixty pages. It is a book that the student of the France before the Revolution will want to have close at hand and he should feel grateful to M. Marion for the sacrifice of time that the preparation of such a work necessarily entailed.

Fred Morrow Fling.

Parliamentary Papers of John Robinson, 1774–1784. Edited for the Royal Historical Society by William Thomas Laprade, Ph.D., Professor of History in Trinity College, North Carolina. [Publications, Camden third series, vol. XXXIII.] (London, the Society, 1922, pp. xx, 198.) This collection of documents presents to the student a most realistic picture of elections in action in Great Britain during the later years of the eighteenth century. Those familiar with Porritt's *Unreformed*

Parliament or kindred books may here examine the methods portrayed in all their sordid detail and pettiness. No guesswork is required, no difficult inferences need to be drawn.

John Robinson was the crony of Charles Jenkinson, Richard Atkinson, and Richard Rigby, all familiar with the ways and means of winning parliamentary support, but of them all Robinson probably was the best informed. From 1774 to 1784 he was senior secretary of the Treasury Board. The duties of that office, illustrated in this volume, were the superintendence of parliamentary business, the eighteenth-century counterpart of the business of the modern whip, and the supervision of elections. In the performance of the latter he was custodian of the money devoted to the purpose.

Robinson superintended two general elections, those of 1774 and 1780, and also practically that of 1784, since his successor in office, George Rose, was a novice. Documents illustrating all these elections are printed, but the most interesting and complete ones concern the last election. The editor is surely moderate in declaring that the "state" of political conditions in counties and boroughs "is perhaps the most detailed description extant of the actual forces represented in the parliaments of the latter part of the eighteenth century" (p. 65). It was prepared for the purpose of persuading Pitt that he could command a majority in the House of Commons.

The detailed statement concerning the proposed election of 1784 will prove illuminating to those historians who have been contented with the tradition that William Pitt made on that occasion an appeal to public opinion similar in kind to those of later years and that he was raised to power as the "champion of purity of elections". The papers of John Robinson prove that the only appeal made was directed to the small group of politicians who had always controlled politics. The game of 1784 was not in essence different from those in which the chief player had been Sir Robert Walpole or the Duke of Newcastle. In comparison with present-day practices the sum of money employed for election purposes was not large.

Clarence W. Alvord.

La France depuis 1870. Par Michel Lhéritier, Docteur ès Lettres, Agrégé d'Histoire. (Paris, Librairie Felix Alcan, 1922, pp. xvi, 255. 9 fr.) M. Lhéritier has attempted to compress the history of the Third Republic into sixty thousand words. His undertaking is all the more ambitious in that he has tried to take in the whole range of French activity. Everything that was done in France from 1870 to 1922 is included. An alphabetically arranged list starting with Acting and ending with Zoology would perhaps best indicate the scope of the book.

The plan of presentation shows considerable skill. There are nine chapters of about equal length, each dealing with a period of from one to eight years. Within the chapters the arrangement is by topics, but with the list varying from chapter to chapter.

A good plan, however, is not enough. The vital touch can be imparted to a book of this description only by one who has exceptional literary talent and knows how to repress unnecessary details. M. Lhéritier does not exhibit either of these gifts. His style is simple and clear enough, but lacks distinction. Many passages are little more than enumerations of statistics, lists of laws, or names of writers, artists, and their works.

As a manual for reference, accurate in the main and well organized, the book has merit. As a narrative of the things which have made the last half-century one of the most remarkable periods in French history it is disappointing.

Frank Maloy Anderson.

Holland under Queen Wilhelmina. By A. J. Barnouw, Professor in Columbia University. (New York and London, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923, pp. xiii, 321, $3.00.) Students of contemporary European history will be pleased with this admirable statement. The author, who has spent a good part of his life in educational work in the Hague, is personally acquainted with most if not all of the prominent characters in the political and intellectual life of the nation. He has accurate knowledge of the subject and in no way overstates the significant achievements of his native land.

Students will be pleased with the correct statement of the Dutch case in connection with the fortifications question of 1912–1913, so diversely interpreted in foreign journals of the time. Valuable also is the account of the futile attempt to develop a Dutch-Belgian alliance between 1905 and 1912, in which some Entente journals evinced considerable interest. Other important matters are the Dutch attitude toward the Boer War, the trying days during the late war when Holland sought to maintain her traditional policy of aloofness, the economic problems attending the war, the numerous refugees, and especially the case of the German Kaiser and the Belgian desire to expand by incorporating parts of Limburg and the left bank of the Scheldt. Chapter XVII. deals with literature, art, and science. The author here is modest in his statements. The achievements in anthropology might well have been stated and a further discussion of theological and religious matters would have been desirable. In fact little is said of the religious life of the nation except in so far as it concerns the conservative Catholic and Calvinistic participation in politics. The value of the book might have been further enhanced by a list of the more important works dealing with the period, as, for example, those of Japikse, Brugmans, Colenbrander, and others.

Henry S. Lucas.

Official German Documents relating to the World War. In two volumes. Translated under the supervision of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Division of International Law. (New York, Oxford

University Press, 1923, pp. xv, 684; xi, 685–1360, $7.50.) On August 20, 1919, the German National Constituent Assembly created a committee to investigate the problem of war responsibilities. Four subcommittees were formed, of which the first was to report upon the causes of the war and the second upon the failure to end it sooner. The volumes under review consist of the reports of these two subcommittees, the second of which has appended stenographic minutes of the sessions that were held and a mass of pertinent correspondence.

The report of the First Subcommittee is comparatively brief (120 pp.) and is made up of written statements sent to the committee by a large number of German statesmen, soldiers, and men of business, including Bethmann, von Jagow, Zimmermann, Falkenhayn, Tirpitz, and Helfferich. These statements are couched in the form of answers to specific questions put by the committee, designed to determine the degree of German official responsibility for the ultimatum to Serbia and the fact or character of any preparations for war in Germany previous to July 23. While many of these answers are perfunctory, others, which may be regarded as abbreviated memoirs on the critical twelve days, form a valuable supplement to the Kautsky *Documents*. Of especial interest are the marginal annotations of Tschirschky on his instructions from Berlin.

The report of the Second Subcommittee is of greater extent and far more significance. With ancillary documents it covers 559 pages of the first volume and the entire 653 pages of the second volume. The investigations of this committee were confined to the period immediately preceding and following President Wilson's note of December 21, 1916, which urged upon the belligerents the desirability of stating their war aims. The report in itself is brief and not particularly illuminating. The conclusions reached by the investigators, which seem to throw entire responsibility upon the German civil government as well as the High Command and Admiralty staff for letting slip an opportunity to initiate peace parleys at that time, are open to question; there is some justice in the bitter criticism launched by the dissenting committeeman, Schultz-Bromberg, at the methods used in the construction of the report. But the stenographic minutes of evidence, containing the oral testimony of Bernstorff, Bethmann, Helfferich, Capelle, Zimmermann, and Ludendorff, are of great historical value; and it is difficult to overestimate the importance of the 365 pages of diplomatic correspondence which form the latter portion of the second volume. This includes despatches exchanged between Berlin and Washington from April, 1916, to February, 1917; correspondence with Germany's allies concerning peace terms in the autumn of 1916; reports, correspondence, and protocols dealing with the necessity of the unrestricted U-boat warfare; numerous despatches and letters concerning the attitude of the United States during the entire course of the year 1916, the probability of mediation by President Wilson, and the final break in diplomatic relations. The collection furnishes the

most authoritative evidence thus far published of Germany's political condition and the plans of her rulers immediately previous to American participation in the war.

CHARLES SEYMOUR.

The Open Door Policy. By En Tsung Yen, Ph.D., Lecturer of Chinese at Georgetown University. (Boston, Stratford Company, 1923, pp. ix, 191, $2.00.) This is an interesting volume. Dr. Yen first reviews briefly the period prior to Secretary Hay's notes of 1899. The opening sentence is slightly inaccurate. The author says: "Since the dawn of history to the middle of the nineteenth century . . . China's door was closed." He forgot the welcome given to Romans, Persians, Arabs, and Indians between the second and sixteenth centuries, the freedom of intercourse, the trade of the tenth and eleventh centuries, and the edict of the Manchus in 1685 opening all the ports of China.

The repeated defeat of China in war, it is correctly shown, was the revelation of her weakness that invited the aggression of the West. Her humiliation by Japan further encouraged that aggression. That war was followed by demands for leases of territory and claims to spheres of interest. It is well to remember that these demands and claims were the immediate and natural causes of the Boxer Rising.

Dr. Yen considers the various agreements relating to the Open Door and carefully weighs the interests of the several powers and the motives actuating them. Full credit is given to the American government for its activity in support of the policy.

The most interesting chapters are those dealing with Japan's aggressions. These are set forth clearly and truthfully and without exaggeration. The author does not believe that the Washington Conference solved the Far Eastern problem.

The value of the International Consortium in putting an end to spheres of interest is fully recognized, but, in the end, as is admitted, China must depend upon herself rather than others.

The book can be improved by more careful proof-reading and by uniformity in spelling proper names.

E. T. WILLIAMS.

The Open Door Doctrine in Relation to China. By Mingchien Joshua Bau, Ph.D. [Knights of Columbus Historical Series.] (New York, Macmillan Company, 1923, pp. xxviii, 245, $2.50.) This volume concerns one of the most important policies with which American diplomacy has had to deal. Within the brief compass of 191 pages the author reviews the history of the Open Door Doctrine, traces its development, and notes its political implications, particularly its relation to the claims of certain powers to the possession of spheres of interest in China. International co-operation rather than international struggle for concessions he finds necessary to a practical application of the doctrine to great industrial

undertakings. "The principles of the doctrine", he tells us, "are not new but old." American interest in equality of commercial opportunity began with the beginning of our trade with China and found expression in the negotiation of our first treaty with that country. But a need for the assertion of the doctrine arose near the close of the nineteenth century when China's defeat in war and loss of dependencies revealed her weakness and led to a scramble among the nations for leased territories, spheres of interest, and concessions.

Three things he regards as essential to the maintenance of an "open door" in China—the co-operation of China, "the direct participation of the United States in the international affairs of China", and the co-operation of the other interested powers. These three essential conditions, he notes, have been provided for in the nine-power treaty signed at Washington in 1922. He assumes that that treaty will be ratified, but as yet this has not been done by all the signatories, and until the ratifications are deposited in Washington the treaty does not go into effect.

The principal public documents dealing with the subject are analyzed. Their texts are supplied in the appendixes. A bibliography and an index add to the usefulness of the book.

E. T. W.

The William L. Clements Library of Americana at the University of Michigan. [By William L. Clements.] (Ann Arbor, the University, 1923, pp. xii, 228.) Mr. William L. Clements is almost alone among the great collectors of Americana in having a comprehensive knowledge of the contents and meaning of his books, and in having formed a library with the specific purpose of gathering all the source-books relating to America from the era of discovery through the period of the Revolution. Therefore a descriptive account of his collection means much more to the student of history than the usual catalogue or check-list of titles. In the book under review he has attempted to summarize the important contemporary publications and source-material, to weigh their influence and reliability, and to weave the whole into an intelligible and serviceable narrative. The books summarized are grouped under chapter-headings covering the periods of discovery, exploration, settlement, growth of the colonies, colonial wars, and the Revolution. The two chapters last mentioned seem to contain the largest reference to material new to the student, especially the chapter on the Revolution, which describes the recently acquired Shelburne Papers and the pamphlet literature of the period.

Although a description of a library, it is not in the field of bibliography that the book is of value, but rather as a graphic and broad survey of early American history, and in this field few books, even those with more pretentious titles, have been so successful and so stimulative to research. The style is readable, often with novelty of expression; the book

is well proof-read and there are few errors. There is no index, but this is not a notable deficiency since the chapter arrangement is chronological and the titles and authors easily located.

CLARENCE S. BRIGHAM.

Three Centuries of American Democracy. By William MacDonald, LL.D., sometime Professor of American History in Brown University. (New York, Henry Holt and Company, 1923, pp. vii, 346, $2.25.) This little book is better described by the publisher's subtitle "a brief and simply written history of the United States" than by the formal title. For in fact the story of *Three Centuries of American Democracy*, as told, is hardly more than the conventional chronological account of American political history to be found in other studies of a similar character. The titles of the chapters will indicate this, *e.g.*, the Centuries of Beginnings, Through the Revolution to Independence, Framing a National Constitution, the Organization of Government and Politics, Democracy and Nationality, etc. One might reasonably expect from the title to find some discussion of topics directly related to the development of democracy, such as the land question and the West, representation and suffrage, religious liberty, the labor movement, education, and in general the enlargement of opportunity for the masses. But except for the bare mention of some of these questions in the last and best chapter, Politics and the American Mind (ch. XI.), the reader will be little the wiser, with respect to such topics, for having read this book. Designed for persons with a limited knowledge of American history and with "no time to read elaborate narratives or to study a series of books on special periods or topics" (preface), one is doubtful whether the average reader will comprehend the complex history of the development of American political, economic, and social democracy from this very brief and limited outline. The author does not give much emphasis to the sectional interpretation of American history, and some of his views are not in line with recent studies and interpretations, such as "the union which came later was the fruit of outside happenings, not of inward discontent with lot or place" (p. 286); and there was "comparative absence of lawless excess and personal self-seeking" in the American Revolution (p. 290).

The book is a simple, straightforward, and clearly written account of the larger political events and forces of United States history, with worth-while comments and criticisms, *e.g.*, on the Constitution (p. 70) and Jackson (p. 161). For those who want their American history boiled down to the absolute minimum, this book will serve a useful purpose. There is a brief bibliography for each chapter, an index, and a chronological outline (pp. 319–334).

M. W. JERNEGAN.

Building the American Nation: an Essay of Interpretation. By Nicholas Murray Butler, President of Columbia University. (New York,

Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923, pp. xviii, 375, $2.50.) Would that there were more foundations similar to the one which occasioned this book—the George Watson Foundation for American history, literature, and institutions; for the better the English-speaking peoples know and understand each other, the better it will be for this troubled world and its affairs. In 1923 President Butler delivered for the Watson Foundation a series of seven lectures before a number of British universities. The lectures have for their common theme "Building the American Nation". The author endeavors to present our constitutional history and development largely around, and in terms of, those ten or a dozen personalities considered by him most significant for their public services.

Considering the place and purpose of the lectures, one can say "well and happily done"; but, if considered as a volume for readers of this *Review*, one would have to add reservations. A critical scholar will be likely to say that no great contribution is made to the literature of American history; the author has not kept pace with the monographic work of the field (and yet, in the position he has occupied for some years, how could he be expected to do so?); some of his interpretations can be questioned; queer judgment is sometimes shown in facts to be narrated and movements to be interpreted; at places he shows markedly his biases and prejudices. At times it is clear that he aims at dramatized biography with success—some of his word-portraits and character-sketches are truly well done; but the book is uneven, for some sections remind one of a grade-school text rather than "an impressive interpretation" promised on the book's jacket. It seems clear, perhaps too frequently, that that of which he approves is nation-building, and that of which he does not approve is destructive of nation-building. He is unexpectedly generous to Calhoun, but does not understand the ante-bellum South. He has not been impressed by Justin H. Smith's book on the Mexican War, among others of importance. In the last chapter he abandons personalities and uses the heading Fifty Years of Growth and Change; he really does not develop this subject, but indulges in some moral philosophy and personal opinions on a few current problems and tendencies.

From the standpoint of American readers, the reviewer is inclined to believe that the author would have rendered a greater service had he published some impressions and sympathetic interpretations of his English friends and observations.

C. S. Boucher.

Francis Asbury in the Making of American Methodism. By H. K. Carroll, LL.D. (New York and Cincinnati, Methodist Book Concern; New York, Abingdon Press, 1923, pp. 250, $2.00.) Shall Asbury have a statue? Shall the unlettered itinerant who came to the British colonies in 1771 "to live to God and to bring others so to do" rank with statesmen who founded a nation and with military heroes who have likewise been accorded the honor of equestrian statues in the national capital?

This brief and sympathetic account of Asbury's part in the early history of American Methodism is written in answer to this question. It is written in fullness of knowledge by one who has long since laid students of religious history under contribution.

The book will not replace, nor is it intended to replace, the longer and more elaborate biographies of this early founder of Methodism. It is intended for the reader with scant leisure who may wish authentic information while being spared the tedious task of following intricate controversial discussions that encumber so many religious biographies and histories. The few controversial points touched upon here are presented with such lucidity as to be intelligible to the lay mind, at first reading. The narrative of Asbury's career is simple and direct. Illustrated by significant extracts from his own journal and from the writings of his contemporaries, the story reveals the devotional spirit that dominated his ministry and his practical judgment in adapting that ministry to pioneer life and the conditions of an undeveloped country. The author's wide knowledge of the history and organization of other religious denominations in the United States has made it possible for him to summarize the general characteristics of the religious situation in the late eighteenth century and thus to place the figure of the first itinerant Methodist bishop in strong relief against the background of religious life in his own time. From the literary point of view the book would have gained by the omission of three chapters dealing with special aspects of Methodism. Placed as they are, these chapters interrupt the story and check the reader's interest in following the seemingly ceaseless journeyings of the first and most distinguished of a long line of circuit-riders in America.

MARTHA L. EDWARDS.

Circuit-Rider Days along the Ohio: being the Journals of the Ohio Conference from its Organization in 1812 to 1826. Edited with Introduction and Notes by William Warren Sweet, Professor of History in DePauw University. (New York and Cincinnati, Methodist Book Concern, 1923, pp. 299, $2.00.) With this volume Professor Sweet completes the publication of the manuscript Journals of the first Methodist Conferences north of the Ohio. Chronologically it fills in the gap between his *Western Methodism* and *The Circuit Rider in Indiana.* The method is the same as in the earlier books, about one-half of the space being given to the text of the Journal and the remainder to summary accounts. The first of four introductory chapters is a brief résumé of conditions in the West drawn from standard secondary authorities. The others give sketches of the work of the Conference and are based entirely on Methodist sources. This intentional limitation of source-material results in the omission of some facts having an important bearing upon the development of Methodism in the West. In the account of the Wyandot mission, for example, the earlier influence of Catholic

missionaries is recognized, while that of the Quakers who were in exclusive control of the Wyandot agency for several years preceding the outbreak of war in 1811 is entirely ignored. The fact that Methodist sources forbear to mention the work of the Friends which had in some degree prepared the way for the success of later missionaries is in itself significant, as it reveals a characteristic of extreme importance in the religious development of the West.

The publication of these Journals is no doubt a gratification to sectarian pride. Historically they add surprisingly little to the information elsewhere available. The method adopted in the three books that constitute a logical series involves repetition which might have been avoided by publishing the Journals of the three Conferences in a single volume preceded by a brief introduction. Conceived at the outset upon this more comprehensive plan the work of the editor would have been of much greater service to students of religious history in the United States.

Martha L. Edwards.

The American Struggle for the British West India Carrying-Trade, 1815–1830. By F. Lee Benns, Assistant Professor of History, Indiana University. [Justin Winsor Prize Essay, 1920.] (*Indiana University Studies*, no. 56, in vol. X., pp. 1–207, $.75.) Within the actual limitations of his title the author has done an excellent piece of work. The American side of the "struggle" is set forth most ably from official publications and other printed sources; and the grimness of the narrative which emerges is relieved by newspaper extracts reflecting public opinion—extracts which, by the way, account for "over forty per cent. of the citations" and no inconsiderable portion of the text. But in all it is a dreary story, and one unfit for perusal by pupils in New York public schools. For, if both governments showed a taste for close-fisted bargaining, our own, in its truculence, in its attempts to dictate the conditions under which British intercolonial trade should be carried on, and in the retreat which it was finally forced to make, cuts by no means the more dignified or attractive figure of the two. Less patriotic and more advanced students will find the book useful both in substance and in documentation. Yet one would wish that the writer had given to his reading a somewhat wider range. His introductory pages, covering the years following directly upon the American Revolution, are unsatisfactory. A better acquaintance with recent literature would have shown him the danger of relying upon the statistics of Bryan Edwards or of colonial assemblies, or of accepting estimates of British views and motives from John Adams and the *American Annual Register.* The mistakes in detail are not serious; but there is grave misrepresentation in the statement that "the complaints of the West Indian planters and merchants went unheeded; the British colonial system must be maintained" (p. 10). Such errors do not occur in the body of the work;

but even here one sometimes wishes that the writer had either restricted or widened his field of inquiry. He would have been safe, and well within his rights, had he treated the British side only as presented officially to our State Department; but at times he steps, without adequate precaution, onto wider ground. Remembering the rich store of material available, it is unsafe to estimate British motives, or even the British "position", from Hansard, the despatches selected for publication, and a dozen or so of books and articles. Nor is one quite satisfied with a presentation which, in dealing with the negotiations as a whole, fails to note their relation either to the other negotiations proceeding simultaneously between the two governments, or to the general relaxation of the British navigation system. But these faults, such as they are, detract but little from the reader's appreciation of unusually efficient workmanship and perfect fairness.

H. C. B.

The Anthropology of Florida. By Aleš Hrdlička, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C. [Publications of the Florida State Historical Society, no. 1.] (Deland, the Society, 1922, pp. xviii, 140, x.) The latter part of October, 1918, Dr. Hrdlička went to Florida and made a reconnoissance of the archaeological remains on the west coast in the extreme southern part of the state in Lee and Monroe counties. Here are situated the Ten Thousand Islands lying just west of the Everglades. The late Frank H. Cushing had made some remarkable discoveries near Key Marco. Dr. Hrdlička quotes the publications of Mr. Clarence B. Moore at some length since he (Moore) has done much work in Florida. The primary object of Dr. Hrdlička's visit was to secure skeletal material. In this he was rather disappointed, but he has presented us a very important publication on the extent of the shell-mounds, canals, village sites, and other indications of aboriginal occupation. The west coast offers a fruitful field for explorations. Although Dr. Hrdlička states that the jungles, swamps, mosquitoes, and other insects render work difficult, it would appear that a properly outfitted expedition could overcome these obstacles.

We are chiefly concerned with his conclusions, which are given at some length. Dr. Hrdlička follows the general trend observed in reports written by most of the men in the Bureau of Ethnology and Smithsonian Institution, *i.e.*, that our Indian remains are not ancient. He is speaking of a region where it was necessary for the natives to build mounds and platforms of shells and earth, sometimes so extensive that they cover more than fifty acres. The country was covered with a growth of mangrove jungle then as now. If it is difficult for white people with steel axes to clear it, imagine the task confronting the Indians, who possessed naught but stone tools. The very fact that work rivalling in extent the Ohio mounds in Ross County, where conditions are very favorable, was carried to perfection would indicate a considerable

population for a long length of time. Shell-mounds cannot be erected as easily as are earth mounds on a flat plain. No one as yet assigns these people great antiquity—that is, more than five thousand years—but to state that many of the mounds are modern because here and there are found European objects seems to me rather far-fetched. The region merits thorough study covering a number of winters. I would predict that while the summits of many mounds show European contact, the bases would not, and that the bulk of the remains date back into pre-Columbian times.

WARREN K. MOOREHEAD.

The Journal of John Work, a Chief-Trader of the Hudson's Bay Company, during his Expedition from Vancouver to the Flatheads and Blackfeet of the Pacific Northwest. Edited, with an account of the Fur trade in the Northwest and Life of Work, by William S. Lewis and Paul C. Phillips. [Early Western Journals, no. 1.] (Cleveland, Arthur H. Clark Company, 1923, pp. 209, $6.00.) This volume consists of a sketch of the fur trade in the West and Pacific Northwest, a short biography of John Work, and his *Journal* of the Snake Country expedition in 1831–1832, with annotations. The sketch is interestingly written, but fragmentary, incomplete, and out of perspective: in discussing the maritime fur trade no reference is made to Captain Cook, the discoverer of that trade; the work of the French and their successors, the North West Company, is unsatisfactorily treated, even if pertinent as an introduction to the trade in the Snake Country; a careless use of the word "brigade" as synonymous with "expedition" is noticed; too much reliance has been placed on the ill-natured remarks of the Rev. Mr. Beaver; and the generalization upon the obstruction of settlement by the fur traders is scarcely warranted.

The biography bears evidence of much research; the gaps in it are due rather to paucity of materials than to lack of investigation.

The *Journal*, however, which is the justification of the publication, contains little of real value to the student of the fur trade. The somewhat indefinite region known as the Snake Country had, from 1824, been visited annually by the Hudson's Bay Company's expeditions. We have already the accounts of Ross in *The Fur Hunters of the Far West* and his journal of 1824–1825 (*Oregon Historical Quarterly*, vol. XIV.), of Ogden in his journal of 1825–1826 and 1827–1828 (*ibid.*, vols. X. and XI.), and of Work in his journal of 1830–1831 (*ibid.*, vols. XIII. and XIV.), covering a great part of the territory referred to in the volume under review. The only new ground traversed (so far as the traders were concerned) is the Lolo Trail across the Bitter Root Mountains and a small part of western Montana; but even here the *Journal* adds little to a knowledge of that section. It records, largely, the usual difficulties from the inclement weather and from the marauding Blackfeet.

The annotations are useful in the identification of persons and places, though some of them are open to question, for example, the line of the

route from Fort Nez Percé to the Lolo Pass. Evidences of hasty work are to be found in a number of places, as, for instance, in note 291 on page 152, where Alexander MacKenzie is manifestly an error for Donald McKenzie; again in note 76 on page 42, in which the annotator finds difficulty in deciding whether John McLoughlin who testified before the Hudson's Bay Committee in 1857 was Dr. John McLoughlin when the most cursory glance at his evidence shows that he was not—and it is well known that Dr. McLoughlin died at Oregon City in 1857.

In truth the text is not of importance to justify such elaborate publication.

F. W. HOWAY.

Ranald MacDonald: the Narrative of his Early Life on the Columbia under the Hudson's Bay Company's Regime; of his Experiences in the Pacific Whale Fishery; and of his Great Adventure to Japan; with a Sketch of his Later Life on the Western Frontier, 1824–1894. Edited and annotated from the original manuscripts by William S. Lewis and Naojiro Murakami. (Spokane, Washington, Eastern Washington State Historical Society, 1923, pp. 333, $7.50; to libraries, $6.75.) This book belongs to a very small group of narratives of visits to Japan prior to the opening of that country in 1854. As such, it is of great interest. It cannot be classed, however, along with the works of Kaempfer, Golovnin, or Siebold, because our author's opportunities for observation were strictly limited, and because he confined himself to a simple narrative of what he saw and heard.

Taking these limitations into account Ranald MacDonald has described with minuteness and considerable detail the habits and customs of the people who came under his observation during the voyage from the Hokkaido to Nagasaki and during the period of his imprisonment, which extended from the middle of October, 1848, till the third week of April, 1849.

Perhaps his most interesting contribution to our knowledge relates to the treatment by the Japanese authorities of sailors shipwrecked on the coast of Japan. MacDonald was treated with the greatest consideration and kindness, even though kept under the strictest surveillance. He maintains that fifteen other American sailors cast up on the Japanese coast at about the same time were likewise treated with kindness and consideration, even though they, unlike himself, by their lawless behavior caused the Japanese authorities great annoyance and inconvenience.

MacDonald's observations on the Japanese religious and moral codes as well as the political situation are unsatisfactory, because they were written out some forty years after his Japanese adventure and from recollections of his conversations with the few Japanese whom he encountered.

The editors have performed their task with almost loving care and have made the text of the narrative easily understandable. Without the

foot-notes and annotations there is much in the narrative that would be obscure. The Eastern Washington State Historical Society is to be congratulated heartily upon bringing out this contribution to our knowledge of the earliest period of our intercourse with Japan.

WALTER W. MCLAREN.

Legislative History of America's Economic Policy toward the Philippines. By José S. Reyes, Ph.D. [Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law, vol. CVI., no. 2.] (New York, Longmans, Green, and Company; London, P. S. King and Son, Ltd., 1923, pp. 205, $2.25.) The reawakening interest manifested in the United States with respect to the Philippine Islands should assure this volume a hearing. It is a careful review, from the Filipino angle, of legislation in Congress affecting the economic interests of the Far Eastern possession of this country. A better wording of the title would have been "Legislative History of the Economic Policy of the United States toward the Philippines", thus avoiding the use of the word "America". Some might be inclined to question whether Congress has had any settled policy, economic or otherwise, with respect to the archipelago. However, without entering here into any argument on this score, and assuming that there has been some sort of a continuous policy in Congress, it is enough to note that the author, by describing and analyzing the several periods of discussion and legislative action, has attempted to trace the course of the United States, economically considered, toward the Philippines.

In doing this, he has discussed the ratification of the Treaty of Paris of December 10, 1898; the constitutional relation of the Philippines to the United States; the tariff on goods imported into the Philippines; the tariff on Philippine goods exported to the United States; the coastwise shipping legislation; public lands, franchises, and the public debt; and currency legislation. He concludes among other things that it is "an unquestioned fact that America's Philippine policy has shown a liberality unequalled in the history of other colonial powers" (p. 196); but that "while there was a strong and sincere desire to regard the welfare of the islands as a sacred trust, still the interests of the United States were also the decisive factors" (p. 198). And he asks whether, if "instead of an American Congress, it had been a Filipino legislature which took charge of legislation", the results would have been the same. Assuredly they would not, but the question furnishes fertile ground for controversy, which the reviewer has no wish to arouse.

The matters discussed in this thesis have needed a grouping together in monographic form, and it is well that a Filipino has accomplished the task. A similar work from the American viewpoint is still awaited. Although the several subjects lend themselves readily to Philippine nationalistic utterances, Mr. Reyes has written with unusual restraint. His book will prove of value to students, both for instruction and for suggestions. His main sources are the debates and reports of Congress, but he has

made abundant use of newspapers and a lesser use of certain authors. His bibliography would have been improved had he accompanied it with critical comments. A mere list is insufficient. The appearance of the volume would also have been bettered had he had some help in his proof-reading.

James A. Robertson.

The Republics of Latin America: their History, Governments, and Economic Conditions. By Herman G. James, Professor of Government at the University of Texas, and Percy A. Martin, Professor of History at Stanford University. (New York and London, Harper and Brothers, 1923, pp. x, 533, $3.50.) The authors say that their book has been prepared for use in college courses in history, government, and foreign trade. As an introduction to, or for required collateral reading in connection with, a course in Latin American trade to supply the necessary minimum of knowledge concerning the history and government of the countries, it is more satisfactory than any single book previously obtainable. For a general study of the governments of Latin American countries it is also better than any existing volume. Although the historical portions are too brief to prove entirely satisfactory for use in a history course conducted exclusively on the text-book plan, yet for required general reading during the first few weeks of a lecture course in Latin American history it will be found valuable, since it will supply the student with a brief introduction to the study of each of the various countries, preparing the field for the instructor's lectures and for the later required advanced readings in more detailed historical treatises, extensive help in the selection of which will be found in the appended bibliographical chapter.

The first chapter, discussing the European background, native races, discovery and settlement, the second, on the colonial systems, and the third, on the struggle for Spanish American independence, are general, tracing developments in all of the colonies simultaneously. The first two contain very meagre historical information, being almost wholly institutional. The remainder, except the last chapter, which is on international relations, instead of being a general treatise on Latin America is really a bundle of primers or encyclopaedic articles, each containing a study of a single country, approximately the first half being historical and the last half governmental, with a brief economic-geographic portion inserted between, a method of presentation which the writers admit "is not without its disadvantages".

William R. Manning.

HISTORICAL NEWS

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

By the date of issue of this number of the *Review* the thirty-eighth annual meeting of the American Historical Association will have taken place at Columbus, on December 27, 28, and 29. The programme, distributed to the members of the Association at the beginning of December, is one marked by exceptional interest. The railroad associations arranged for return tickets, on the certificate plan, at half price. The Committee on Nominations reported to all the members, by circular sent out at the beginning of December, the following nominations: for president, Woodrow Wilson; for first vice-president, Charles M. Andrews; for second vice-president, Dana C. Munro; for secretary, John S. Bassett; for treasurer, Charles Moore; for the executive council, Arthur L. Cross, Sidney B. Fay, Carlton J. H. Hayes, Frederic L. Paxson, Henry P. Biggar, Mary W. Williams, Arthur M. Schlesinger, and Charles H. McIlwain.

At a meeting of the Executive Council held in New York on November 24, it was reported that much the greatest part of the proposed *Manual of Historical Literature* is ready for printing. The committee on bibliography of modern English history reported such arrangements with the English committee with which it is correlated as will permit the former to send to the printer before many months the completed manuscript of the volume for the Tudor period, leaving to the English committee the volume for the period of the Stuarts.

The first of the two volumes of the *Annual Report* for the year 1919 has at last emerged from the Government Printing Office and is commented upon on another page. The supplementary or third volume for the next year, Miss Grace G. Griffin's annual bibliography, *Writings on American History, 1920,* has also appeared (pp. xiii, 267). It chronicles 3161 books, pamphlets, or articles respecting American history, in accordance with the plan followed in the previous volumes of this series, and with the same extraordinary accuracy, thoroughness of search, and intelligence of comment. Attention may properly be called to the fact that, whereas in all other countries, so far as is remembered, all such annual bibliographies of national history have had but a short life, sustained for a few years and then expiring, this manual, sustained by American historical societies and a few individuals, has remained in continuous existence since 1906.

Dr. Joseph Schafer, secretary of the Association's Conference of Historical Societies, has printed the *Proceedings* of the eighteenth of these annual conferences, the one held at New Haven in December, 1922,

in a pamphlet of eighteen pages, containing also the paper on Florida as a Field for Historical Research, read on that occasion by Mr. John B. Stetson, jr., and summaries of the three other papers then read.

The Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association met at the University of California, Berkeley, on November 30 and December 1. There were papers by Professors Waldemar Westergaard on Swedish History and Historians, Frank A. Golder on Soviet Russia, John C. Parish on our Ex-Presidents, and Y. Ichihashi on the Four-Power Pacific Pact and the Anglo-Japanese Alliance. There was also the usual session for teachers of history in schools.

PERSONAL

Dr. Edward Stanwood of Boston, author of a useful *History of Presidential Elections,* first published in 1884, and brought out in subsequent versions under the title *History of the Presidency,* died on October 11, at the age of eighty-two.

Friedrich Delitzsch, the celebrated professor of Assyriology in the University of Berlin, died last summer at the age of seventy-three. His chief historical work was his *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens,* first published in 1891.

Auguste Bouché-Leclercq, a member of the Faculty of Letters of Paris since 1879, died recently at the age of eighty-one. His *Manuel des Institutions Romaines* (1886), his *Histoire des Lagides* (4 vols., 1903–1907), and his *Histoire des Seleucides* (4 vols., 1913–1914), were all highly esteemed.

Dr. Ernest Barker, principal of King's College, London, lectures at Amherst College during the second half of the present academic year, chiefly in the field of the history of political theory.

Dr. Randolph G. Adams, besides becoming librarian of the William L. Clements Library at the University of Michigan as was mentioned in our last number, has also been made a professor of history in that institution.

Professor Albert A. Trever has received a year's leave of absence from Lawrence College, Appleton, Wis., and is spending it as acting professor of ancient history in Cornell University.

Mr. Ernest W. Nelson, formerly of Cornell University, is now assistant professor of history in the University of South Dakota.

Professor Frank A. Golder, occupied for two years past with the work of the American Relief Expedition in Russia, and elsewhere in Europe, has now returned to the work of teaching at Leland Stanford.

GENERAL

The Twenty-first International Congress of Americanists will hold its sessions this summer at the Hague and at Gothenburg. The dates

for the first session (Hague) are August 12 to 16; those of the second (Gothenburg) August 20 to 25. The general secretary of the former is Dr. D. Albers, Van Oldenbarneveltlaan 61, the Hague; of the latter Baron Erland Nordenskiöld, at the Museum, Gothenburg. The proceedings will be of the usual character.

The October number of the *Historical Outlook* contains an article by Professor C. J. H. Hayes on Nationalism and the Social Studies, and one by Jessie C. Evans on Teaching International Relations through the Social Studies. The principal article in the November number is Franco-British Rivalry and the Entente Cordiale, by Professor H. J. Carman; but there is much material on "history tests" and their use in schools. The December number is designated as the "Second Year Book of the National Council for the Social Studies".

The October number of *History* includes an article by Mrs. Hilary Jenkinson on the Jewels Lost in the Wash, containing new evidence of the nature and fate of King John's treasures; one by R. N. Kershaw on the Recruiting of the Long Parliament, 1645–1647; and a third by Professor A. F. Hattersley on the Emancipation of Slaves at the Cape. The Headmaster of Sherborne contributes an article to the series on the Teaching of History in Schools.

The *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester,* for August, 1923, includes, among others, the following documented articles: Philadelphia and Montanism, by W. M. Calder; a New Christian Apology (probably of the second century), by J. Rendel Harris; the Wardrobe and Household of Henry, son of Edward I., by Professor Hilda Johnstone; and Notes on Greek from the Lectures of a Ninth-Century Monastery Teacher, by M. L. W. Laistner.

In the October number of the *Catholic Historical Review* there are articles on the Bollandists, by Dr. Aurelio Palmieri; on St. Edmund's College, Old Hall, by Canon Edwin H. Burton, lately its president; and on "The Knell of German Protestantism", *i.e.*, the developments of the Evangelical and Lutheran churches in Germany since the establishment of the Republic, by Dr. Hartmann Grisar, S. J., of Innsbruck.

In the October number of the *Journal of Negro History,* which concludes volume VIII. of that useful journal, there is an article by Albert Parry on Abram Hannibal, Peter the Great's negro, derived from a story by Pushkin, his great-grandson; a valuable paper by A. A. Taylor on Movement of the Negroes from the East to the Gulf States from 1830 to 1850; and one by Elizabeth R. Haynes, partly historical in character, on Negroes in Domestic Service in the United States. Professor William K. Boyd presents some documents and comments on Benefit of Clergy as applied to Slaves.

Mr. D. C. Somervell's *Studies in Statesmanship* (London, G. Bell and Sons) is an endeavor, through a series of studies of representative

statesmen—Pericles, Julius Caesar, Charles the Great, Innocent III., Richelieu, Washington, Napoleon, Bismarck, Gladstone—to illustrate the evolution of European political ideas and institutions.

Six lectures on *The Development of the Sciences* (Yale University Press), delivered at Yale University in 1920, are now published as constituting, in a way, a one-volume history of science. The historical developments of mathematics, physics, chemistry, astronomy, geology, and biology are treated respectively by Professors E. W. Brown, H. A. Bumstead, John Johnston, Frank Schlesinger, H. E. Gregory, and L. L. Woodruff.

Vol. V. of the *Cambridge Economic Handbooks* is a study of *Population* (Harcourt, Brace, and Co., pp. vii, 180) by Harold Wright, of Pembroke College, Cambridge, in which the author summarizes the data and outlines the main features of the problem. A statement of early population theories as advanced by the Greeks and Romans and as influenced by the early Christians and sixteenth and seventeenth-century writers, a discussion of the Malthusian argument in relation to the changing circumstances of science, industry, discovery, and emigration, and some account of the international problems involved form the contents of an interesting volume.

The American Geographical Society has issued as no. 10 of its Research Series, *Aids to Geographical Research* (pp. xiii, 243), compiled by John K. Wright, librarian of the society. Part I. is devoted to the means of finding material not specifically geographical: general literature, government publications, year-books, dissertations, publications of academies and learned societies, and the literature of related sciences. Under this last subject familiar historical works and reviews are noted. The other three parts of the volume are concerned with strictly geographical bibliographies, the bibliography of maps, suggestions for finding geographical publications, and the listing of geographical periodicals and regional bibliographies. The insertion of blank pages throughout makes it possible for the student to add to the items here printed.

The Oxford University Press combines in one volume, published by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and entitled *Losses of Life Caused by War*, a statistical report covering most of the campaigns from the middle of the eighteenth century to 1913, by Professor Dumas of the University of Lausanne, and a treatise by K. O. Vedel-Petersen, of the Danish statistical department, on military losses of the belligerent countries during the World War, and also on the extra mortality among the civil populations during that period.

Columbia University publishes *A Syllabus for the General Course in American History* (pp. 116), by Dr. R. F. Nichols and Mr. J. A. Krout, instructors in that university, with an introduction to historical method by Professor D. R. Fox. We have also received a syllabus by Professor Bernadotte E. Schmitt, *An Outline of Modern European History*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. F. Gay, *The Rhythm of History* (Harvard Graduates' Magazine, September); G. von Below, *Die Vergleichende Methode* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXI. 2); H. Wendorf, *Dialektik und Materialistische Geschichtsauffassung* (*ibid.*); R. E. Park, *The Natural History of the Newspaper* (American Journal of Sociology, November); E. Rothacker, *Savigny, Grimm, Ranke: ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem Zusammenhang der Historischen Schule* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXVIII. 3); Charles Borgeaud, *Federal Characteristics of the Swiss and American Unions*, II. (Constitutional Review, October).

ANCIENT HISTORY

General review: A. M. Woodward, *Ancient Sparta* (History, October).

After an interval of several years, W. Wreszinski's important *Atlas zur Altägyptischen Kulturgeschichte* has been continued by the publication of Lieferungen 6–12 (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1922, 1923).

The results of Professor George A. Reisner's Harvard-Boston expedition into Egypt are set forth, with elaborate illustrations, in two volumes published by the Harvard University Press, *Excavations at Kerma*, a Nubian garrison town of the Egyptian Middle Kingdom.

What may be called the official account of the *Tomb of Tutankh-Amen* begins with vol. I., illustrated, by Howard Carter and A. C. Mace (London, Cassell, pp. xxiii, 231).

The University Press of Liverpool has lately published *The Rhind Mathematical Papyrus*, edited and translated by T. Eric Peet, professor of Egyptology in the University of Liverpool, the most important document for the study of the early history of mathematics. The editor's introduction treats at length of the origin and nature of Egyptian mathematics.

In the Greek series of the *Aegyptische Urkunden* of the Berlin Museum the latest volume is one of *Papyri und Ostraka der Ptolomäerzeit* (Weidmann)—decrees, official reports, petitions, complaints, contracts, letters—edited by Wilhelm Schubart and Ernst Kühn.

In the *Loeb Classical Library* the most recent publication is a volume bringing together a group of three Greek writers on military strategy and tactics, *Aeneas Tacticus, Asclepiodotus, and Onasander*, presented in Greek text and in an English translation by members of the Illinois Greek Club.

Teachers and graduate students of the classics, history, and related subjects, are invited to attend the second summer session of the American Academy in Rome, in which the history and monuments of the city of Rome and the life and letters of the classical period will be studied under the supervision, as director, of Professor Grant Showerman of the Uni-

versity of Wisconsin, who may be addressed at 410 North Butler Street, Madison. The dates are July 7–Aug. 16, 1924.

The Legacy of Rome (Oxford, Clarendon Press) is a volume of essays edited by Cyril Bailey, containing notable contributions by a variety of experts, the editor writing upon the Religion and Philosophy of Rome, Principal Ernest Barker upon the Conception of Empire, Professor Stuart Jones on the Roman Imperial Organization, Professor de Zulueta on the Science of Law, Dr. Charles Singer on Roman Science, etc.

The American Academy in Rome announces the publication of vols. I. and II. of its *Papers and Monographs*, namely, the *Cults of Campania*, by Professor Roy M. Peterson of the University of Maine, and *Local Cults of Etruria*, by Miss Lily R. Taylor, professor in Vassar College. Orders may be sent to Roscoe Guernsey, executive secretary, 101 Park Avenue, New York.

L. Homo's readable and erudite work, *Problèmes Sociaux de Jadis et d'à Présent* (Paris, Flammarion, 1922), deals with various problems of ancient Roman society, including that of housing. This part of Homo's volume is reviewed at length by R. Cagnat, under the title "La Question de Logement à Rome", in the *Journal des Savants* for January, 1923.

The first volume of H. Grégoire's *Recueil des Inscriptions Grecques Chrétiennes d'Asie Mineure* has been published by Leroux, Paris.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Sir W. M. Flinders Petrie, *New Lights on the Past in Egypt* (Yale Review, October); E. Naville, *L'Égyptologie Française pendant un Siècle, 1822–1892*, III. (Journal des Savants, January); F. Pringsheim, *Juristische Papyri* (Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XVII. 1, 2); J. Carcopino, *L'Intervention Romaine dans l'Orient Hellénique*, I. (Journal des Savants, May); U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Athenion und Aristion* (Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1923, VII.); W. Schur, *Die Orientpolitik des Kaisers Nero* (Klio, Beiheft XV., 1923).

EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

A study by J. Jeremias of the cultural history of the period of the New Testament is being issued under the title *Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu* (Leipzig, Pfeiffer). The first volume treats of *Die Wirtschaftlichen Verhältnisse* (1923).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J. R. Knipfing, *The Libelli of the Decian Persecution* (Harvard Theological Review, October); P. Hildebrand, *Die Absetzung des Papstes Silverius, 537* (Historisches Jahrbuch, XLII. 2).

MEDIEVAL HISTORY

In order to bring into closer association the men and women who are working in the medieval field of study Professor James F. Willard, of the University of Colorado, has begun the issue of a series of bulletins

on the *Progress of Medieval Studies in the United States of America.* The first bulletin comprises a list of such scholars, with note of addresses and of special fields of interest, and lists of their writings during the year ending with November, 1922, and a list of doctors' and masters' theses in progress or completed during the period. Annual issue of this helpful pamphlet is contemplated.

A committee on medieval Latin studies, with representatives from history, modern languages, philosophy, and the classical languages, now organized under the American Council of Learned Societies, has just issued a bulletin reviewing its activities of the past two years and outlining its plans for the future. Any member of the American Historical Association who is interested and who has not received a copy may secure one by writing to the secretary, George R. Coffman, 76 Oxford Street, Cambridge, Mass.

The fourth volume of the *Cambridge Medieval History,* which will shortly be published by the Cambridge University Press, treats the history of the Eastern Roman Empire, bringing it down to the end of the Middle Ages.

The second of the five volumes of M. Beer's *General History of Socialism and Social Struggles* (London, Leonard Parsons) has appeared in translation under the title *Social Struggles in the Middle Ages.*

The Romance of the Law Merchant, by Wyndham A. Bewes (London, Sweet and Maxwell, pp. lx, 148), is described in its subtitle as an introduction to the study of international and commercial law, with some account of the commerce and fairs of the Middle Ages.

G. Mollat has brought out *Lettres Communes des Papes d'Avignon: Jean XXII.* (Paris, Boccard, 1923, pp. 160).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: L. Levillain, *Le Formulaire de Marculf et la Critique Moderne* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, January-June); W. Schönfeld, *Die Xenodochien in Italien und Frankreich im frühen Mittelalter* (Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte, XLIII., Kanon. Abt.); E. Sachau, *Ein Verzeichnis Muhammedanischer Dynastien* (Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, phil.-hist. Kl., 1923, 1); Glöckner, *Bedeutung und Entstehung des Forstbegriffes* (Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XVII. 1, 2); D. Pais, *Les Rapports Franco-Hongrois sous le Règne des Arpád, I. Relations Politico-Dynastiques et Ecclésiastiques* (Revue des Études Hongroises et Finno-Ougriennes, January–June); K. Bücher, *Mittelalterliche Handwerksverbände* (Zeitschrift für die Gesamte Staatswissenschaft, LXXVII. 3); P.-F. Fournier, *Affiches d'Indulgence Manuscrites et Imprimées des XIV^e^, XV^e^, et XVI^e^ Siècles* (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, January–June).

MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

A third edition of Professor Ramsay Muir's *The Expansion of Europe* having been called for, opportunity has been taken to make some changes in the chapter dealing with the events immediately preceding the World War, and, in the place of the last chapter in the earlier editions, to add two long new chapters, one dealing with the light shed by the war on the relations between Europe and the rest of the world, the other with the peace settlement and the problems which it leaves for solution.

An interesting series of papers by R. H. Tawney, on "Religious Thought on Social and Economic Questions in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries", is being published in the *Journal of Political Economy*. The two articles that have already appeared (August, October) deal with "The Medieval Background" and "The Collision of Standards".

Vol. VIII. of M. Édouard Rott's *Histoire de la Représentation de la France auprès des Cantons Suisses* (Paris, Alcan, 1923) covers the years 1676–1684.

The Dutch Alliance and the War against French Trade, 1688–1697 (*Publications* of the University of Manchester, no. 157, Historical Series no. 42), by G. N. Clark of Oxford, editor of the *English Historical Review*, is from the press of Longmans.

The *Memoirs of Ber of Bolechow, 1723–1805* (Oxford University Press, pp. x, 188), translated from the original Hebrew manuscript in the library of Jews' College, London, casts much light on Jewish life in eastern and central Europe in the eighteenth century, the author, a Polish Jew, having been a scholarly wine merchant.

The first two volumes of the *Correspondance du Prince Joseph Poniatowski avec la France* (Posen, 1921, 1923, pp. iv, 206; iv, 348) cover the years 1807–1809. They are published at the expense of the Polish Ministry of Public Instruction.

An important chapter of diplomatic history is dealt with by Giuseppe Gallavresi in his book, *Italia e Austria, 1859–1914* (Milan, Treves, 1923, pp. viii, 339), with aid from the sometime ambassador and minister of foreign affairs, Marquis Emilio Visconti-Venosta.

A volume prepared by Professor John E. Harley of the University of Southern California, *Selected Documents and Material for the Study of International Law and Relations* (Los Angeles, *Times-Mirror* Press, pp. xviii, 412), contains introductory chapters by Mr. Harley on some of the recent arrangements for international co-operation and for the pacific settlement of international disputes, the report of the American delegation to the Washington Conference for the Limitation of Armament, a group of documents preparatory to the Covenant of the League of Nations, the League's statute for the Permanent Court of International Justice, a typical mandate, the Hague Convention of 1907, and the treaties and resolutions adopted by the Washington Conference in 1922.

Die Ermordung des Erzherzogs Franz Ferdinand (Frankfurter Societäts-Druckerei, 1923) is the title of a German translation of a work by Professor Stanojević of the University of Belgrade which is said to contain interesting revelations.

A recent addition to the *Bibliothèque d'Histoire Contemporaine* is *Lloyd George et la France* (Paris, Alcan, 1923, pp. 453), by Jacques Bardoux.

Europe since 1918, by Herbert Adams Gibbons, is a study of the effect of the Treaty of Versailles, and other post-war problems in Europe (Century Company).

The series *L'Europe au Jour le Jour*, by Auguste Gauvain, is brought to a conclusion by the publication of the fourteenth volume (Paris, Bossard, 1923, pp. 624), which covers the period March, 1919–January, 1920.

A. Mousset's study of the formation, constitution, and objects of *La Petite Entente* (Paris, Bossard, 1923, pp. xvi, 192) includes the texts of the treaties made between Czechoslovakia, Jugoslavia, and Rumania.

The Brooklyn *Daily Eagle* continues, in the *Third Year-Book of the League of Nations* (for the year 1922, pp. 434), its valuable series, prepared by Dr. Charles H. Levermore, covering in detail all the activities of the League.

A full account in Spanish of the *Actividades de la Liga de las Naciones*, to the end of 1922, is given in a large volume by Don Cosme de la Torriente, recently president of the Assembly of the League of Nations, and now Cuban ambassador to the United States (Havana, Rambla, Bouza, and Co., pp. xxviii, 491).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Bousquet, *L'Internationalisme Financier au XVI^e Siècle* (Revue de Paris, July 1); Sir Richard Lodge, *The Hanau Controversy in 1744 and the Fall of Carteret* (English Historical Review, October); F. Charles-Roux, *La Turquie, les Mameluks, et la Première Occupation Anglaise en Égypte, 1801–1803*, II. (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, September); Commandant Weil, *Les Préliminaires de l'Expédition de Portugal en 1807, un Rapport de d'Hauterive à l'Empereur* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXXVII. 2); F. Rachfahl, *Die Umwälzung der Neuesten Geschichtsschreibung durch die Letzten Quellen der Bismarckzeit* (Archiv für Politik und Geschichte, May); Colonel A. Grouard, *Les Batailles autour de Metz, Août 1870: Coup d'Oeil d'ensemble* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, September); C. E. Martin, *Growth of Presidential Government in Europe* (American Political Science Review, November).

THE WORLD WAR

The second volume of Mr. Winston Churchill's *The World Crisis*, just published (London, Thornton Butterworth; New York, Scribner), carries the story of the Great War to the year 1915, including the formation of the first coalition government and the matter of the Dardanelles.

Military historians will be interested in *Le Plan de Campagne Allemand de 1914 et son Exécution* (Paris, Payot, 1923, pp. 313), by Réginald Kann; and *Hindenburg et Ludendorff, Stratèges* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1923, pp. viii, 252), by Général Buat, of the French general staff.

Recent volumes treating of phases of the war are *Comment j'ai nommé Foch et Pétain* (Paris, Alcan, 1923), by Paul Painlevé, and *La Guerre, 1914–1922: le Blocus, l'Union Sacrée* (Paris, Plon, 1923, pp. 244, xii), by Denys Cochin.

The third volume of the late Sir Julian Corbett's *Naval Operations*, in the official *History of the Great War*, describes the whole of the Dardanelles campaign and the earlier portions of the operations at Salonika and in Mesopotamia, and those in British home waters up to and including the battle of Jutland. There is an additional volume or case of maps.

The second volume of *La Guerre des Croiseurs* (Paris, Challamel, 1923), by Captain P. Chack, covering the period from Oct. 1, 1914, to the battle of Falkland, has been published.

C. Manfroni's *Storia della Marina Italiana durante la Guerra Mondiale* (Bologna, Zanichelli, 1923, pp. vii, 397) includes hitherto unpublished documents.

The first volume of the official history of the *Campagna di Libia* (Rome, 1923, pp. xiii, 374) has been issued by the staff of the Italian army, through the Ministry of War.

To the official histories of the World War there has been added vol. I. of *The Campaign in Mesopotamia, 1914–1915*, published by Brig.-Gen. F. J. Moberly.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: C. Barbagallo, *Come si scatenò la Guerra Mondiale*, III. (Nuova Rivista Storica, July–August, 1923); Capt. M. Larcher, *La Guerre Turque dans la Guerre Mondiale*, I. *Campagne des Dardanelles* (Archives de la Grande Guerre, IV. 42); G. Dubarbier, *La France en Sibérie et l'Amiral Koltchak* (Nouvelle Revue, October 15).

GREAT BRITAIN

The *Sixteenth Annual Report of the Council of the* [English] *Historical Association*, covering the year ending June 30, 1923, reveals an activity which should be interesting to members of the American Historical Association. From modest beginnings a few years ago the Association has grown until it now has 4415 members, headquarters in London, in the same building with the Royal Historical Society, a growing library from which members all over England may draw, a magazine, *History*, which is becoming well known on this side of the ocean, and a rapidly lengthening series of special publications known as *Leaflets*. The work of the branches in which the Association is organized

constitutes one of its most interesting and characteristic activities. There are at present 53 of these branches, ranging in membership from a dozen to over 400 (London Central), and each branch holds from three to eight meetings during the year. At these meetings papers are read the subjects of which range from local history to the largest aspects of general history; during the last year some eight papers were read on American history. In several cases a branch selected some special subject for study during the year and thus the papers read before it were closely related. Nearly every branch organized one or more excursions of historical interest and all devoted more or less consideration to the teaching of history. The annual meetings of the Association are held in January, in different places; in January, 1924, they are to be in London, and in 1925 in Newcastle.

The members of the historical school at Cambridge join in producing the *Cambridge Historical Journal* as an organ of their school, without intention to compete with the *English Historical Review*. It is to be published annually for the present. In the first number the articles of most value are a general survey of recent work in Italian medieval history, by Mr. C. W. Previté-Orton of St. John's College, and a very interesting account of Baron von Holstein of the German Foreign Office, by Dr. G. P. Gooch. Professor Bury has a brief discussion of a Lost Caesarea in Roman Britain. Sir Ernest Satow, in the longest article, Peace-making, Old and New, discusses the procedures of 1814–1818, and compares them with those of 1918, without great addition of new light, but with careful competence. Among the minor contributions special attention may be called to one on Russia and the *Times* in 1863 and 1873, and one on the resignation of Lord Palmerston in 1853, based on unpublished letters of Queen Victoria and Lord Aberdeen.

The second *Bulletin* of the Institute of Historical Research (London, Longmans) contains Mr. J. P. Gilson's paper on the Homes and Migrations of Historical Manuscripts, read at the "continuation meeting" of the Anglo-American Historical Conference last July.

A posthumous volume by the late Professor F. J. Haverfield, *The Roman Occupation of Britain*, is just now being published by the Oxford University Press, with a memoir and a bibliography by G. Macdonald. Meanwhile a more popular treatment of the matter, based on public lectures delivered in the University of Toronto, is published by Sir Bertram Windle, *The Romans in Britain*.

Last year's Ford Lectures at the University of Oxford were delivered by Dr. J. Armitage Robinson, dean of Wells, and are now published as a book on *The Times of St. Dunstan* (Oxford University Press).

Under the title of *Courtiers' Trifles* Messrs. Chatto and Windus announce the first English translation of the *De Nugis Curialium* of Walter

Map, edited, with introduction and notes, by Professors T. Tupper and M. B. Goble.

Professor James Tait has completed in a second volume his edition of *The Chartulary or Register of the Abbey of St. Werburgh, Chester*, published as vol. LXXXII., new series, of the Chetham Society. The first volume of the chartulary was issued by the society three years ago.

Among the intermediate source-books of history put forth by the University of London, the latest is *England under Henry III.*, illustrated from contemporary sources, by Margaret Hennings.

The Prelude to the Reformation, a study of English church life from the age of Wycliffe to the breach with Rome, by R. S. Arrowsmith, appears in Macmillan's *Studies in Church History*.

Vol. VIII., no. 2, of *Smith College Studies in History* is a treatise of fifty-four pages, including tables of financial statistics, on *The Exchequer in Elizabeth's Reign*, by Dr. Frederick Dietz, formerly of Smith College, but now assistant professor in the University of Illinois.

Messrs. Burns, Oates, and Washbourne, of London, announce the publication of a new edition of Bishop Challoner's *Memoirs of Missionary Priests and other Catholics of both Sexes that Suffered Death in England on Religious Accounts during the years 1577 to 1684*, edited by Father J. Hungerford Pollen, S. J.

E. Volckmann studies the relations between old Prussia and England to the time of James I. in a work entitled *Der Grundstein Britischer Weltmacht* (Würzburg, Memminger, 1923).

The *Baptist Quarterly* for October contains a list, arranged under counties of origin, of English people living in Amsterdam at the beginning of the seventeenth century, by Professor Scheffer of the Mennonite College in Amsterdam.

Mrs. E. S. Grew is about to publish (John Murray) a detailed study of *William Bentinck and William III.*, based on material, in large part unpublished hitherto, in the archives of the Duke of Portland and elsewhere.

The Cambridge University Press is about to publish *The Early Life, Correspondence, and Writings of Edmund Burke*, in which the late Captain Arthur P. I. Samuels of Trinity College, Dublin, depicted Burke's early life and his undergraduate surroundings in that institution. The work was nearly completed at the beginning of the war, in which the author was killed, but it has been completed by his father, Judge A. W. Samuels, of the High Court of Justice in Ireland.

A study of William Wilberforce and Great Britain's abolition of her slave trade has been written by Professor R. Coupland, Beit professor of colonial history in the University of Oxford, and will be published by Humphrey Milford.

Mr. J. A. Spender's *Life of the Rt. Hon. Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, G.C.B.*, published in two volumes by Hodder and Stoughton, is of course an important contribution to recent English political history.

A new supplement (1912–1921) to the *Dictionary of National Biography* is in active preparation. The Oxford University Press is now the publisher.

The Scottish Historical Review for October has articles on Lieutenant-Colonel James Steuart, Jacobite Lieutenant-Governor of Edinburgh Castle [1703–1715], by Major K. A. Moody-Stuart; the Problem of Alsace, by Maurice Wilkinson; the Authorship of the *Eikon Basilike*: the Evidence of William Levett, by Walter Seton; the Captivity of James I., by E. W. M. Balfour-Melville; Fencing the Court, by Sir Philip J. Hamilton-Grierson; and the Quarters of the English Army in Scotland in 1656, by G. Davies.

On fly-leaves of a copy of Sir John Skene's *Regiam Majestatem* (1609) there were found and printed in 1837 a body of historical memoranda now known to have been written by Skene himself. These, together with various autograph corrections of his law-book in that volume and in a copy of the vernacular version of the same book, are now printed by Dr. George Neilson as *Skene's Memorabilia Scotica and Revisals of Regiam Majestatem* (Glasgow, MacLehose, pp. 45).

British government publications: *Calendar of Fine Rolls*, vol. VII., 1356–1368.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Rose Graham, *The Papal Schism of 1378 and the English Province of the Order of Cluny* (English Historical Review, October); Leonard Penlock, *Cardinal Pole and his Friends of Padua* (Dublin Review, October); Egerton Beck, *The Elizabethan Persecution* (*ibid.*); R. N. Kershaw, *The Elections for the Long Parliament, 1640* (English Historical Review, October); W. S. Holdsworth, *Sir Matthew Hale* (Law Quarterly Review, October); S. Dumbell, *Early Liverpool Cotton Imports and the Organisation of the Cotton Market in the Eighteenth Century* (Economic Journal, September); H. W. C. Davis, *Brougham, Lord Grey, and Canning, 1815–1830* (English Historical Review, October).

IRELAND AND THE DOMINIONS

(For Canada, see p. 419; for India, see p. 406.)

Mr. Stephen Gwynn has in the press of Messrs. Macmillan, for early publication, a new *History of Ireland*.

Professor Edmund Curtis of the National University of Ireland has produced *A History of Mediaeval Ireland from 1110 to 1513*, the fruit of much study (London, Macmillan).

Messrs. Routledge of London announce a survey of *The Economic Development of the Overseas Empire, 1765–1914*, by Professor L. A. C. Knowles.

Professor A. Percival Newton of the University of London has in the press two volumes on *The Unification of South Africa.*

The Library Committee of the Commonwealth Parliament has published vol. XVII. of ser. I. of the *Historical Records of Australia* (pp. xviii, 859), containing despatches to and from Sir Richard Bourke, governor of New South Wales, from 1833 to June, 1835.

FRANCE

General reviews: L. Halphen, *Histoire de France: le Moyen Age jusqu'aux Valois* (Revue Historique, July); R. Guyot, *Histoire de France de 1800 à nos Jours, et Questions Générales Contemporaines* (*ibid.*, May).

The Harvard Lectures, founded by Mr. J. H. Hyde, will this year be given by Mr. Waldo G. Leland, of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, at the various French universities, his theme being the history of French colonization in America.

Under the title *Les États d'Artois de leurs Origines à l'Occupation Française, 1340–1640* (Paris, Champion, 1923, pp. vii, 377, 268), C. Hirschauer, librarian at Versailles, treats with great thoroughness and scholarship the history and institutional development of Artois, showing their connection with the general policy of the Netherlands and France.

The Société des Bibliophiles Français has published a *Recueil de Pièces Historiques Imprimées dans le Règne de Louis XI.* (Paris, 1923, 2 vols., pp. 372, 310). The originals are reproduced in facsimile, accompanied by historical and bibliographical notes.

A contribution to social and economic history is made by O. Winckelmann in his detailed study of *Das Fürsorgewesen der Stadt Strassburg vor und nach der Reformation bis zum Ausgang des 16. Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig, Heinsius, pp. xvi, 208, 301). The two parts form the fifth volume of the series *Quellen und Forschungen zur Reformationsgeschichte*, brought out by the Verein für Reformationsgeschichte.

In his work, *The Revolutionary Ideas in France, 1789–1871*, Godfrey Elton emphasizes in particular the distinction between the revolutionary ideas of 1789 and those which lie at the bases of the revolutions attempted in 1848 and 1871 (Longmans).

The fifth and last volume of Pierre de la Gorce's *Histoire Religieuse de la Révolution Française* (Paris, Plon, 1923, pp. iv, 416) has appeared.

Catholicism and the Second French Republic, 1848–1852, by Ross W. Collins, is one of the *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law.*

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: J.-A. Brutails, *La Géographie Monumentale de la France aux Époques Romane et Gothique* (Le Moyen Age, January); Th. Mayer, *Zur Entstehung des Capitulare de Villis* (Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XVII. 1, 2);

M. Prou, *La Formation de l'Unité Française* (Journal des Savants, July); C. Stephenson, *Les "Aides" des Villes Françaises aux XII^e et XIII^e Siècles* (Le Moyen Age, September, 1922); E. Decq, *L'Administration des Eaux et Forêts dans le Domaine Royal en France aux XIV^e et XV^e Siècles*, concl. (Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes, January–June); M. Peyre, *L'Établissement des Français en Corse, 1768–1789*, II. (Revue des Questions Historiques, October); M. B. Garrett, *The Beginning of the French Revolution* (Howard College Bulletin, July); Fr. Braesch, *Les Pétitions du Champ de Mars, 15, 16, 17 Juillet 1791*, II., III. (Revue Historique, May, July); A. Mathiez, *La Révolution et les Subsistances: le Vote du Maximum Général* (Annales Révolutionnaires, July); *id.*, *La Mise en Vigueur du Maximum Général* (*ibid.*, September); C. Richard, *L'Industrie et la Défense Nationale dans la Région du Nord en 1793–1794* (Revue du Nord, February); M. Marion, *Le Retour à la Saine Monnaie après la Révolution* (Revue de Paris, October 1); G. Lacour-Gayet, *Un Procès Politique sous le Directoire: Jorry contre Talleyrand* (*ibid.*, June 15); P. de la Gorce, *Le Concordat de 1801*, III. (Revue des Deux Mondes, October 1); Baron de Méneval, *Lettres de la Reine Hortense et du Prince Louis-Napoléon, 1824–1836*, I., II. (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXXVII. 1. 2); J. Dontenville, *Les Idées Napoléoniennes: la Politique Extérieure de Napoléon III.* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, November); H. Sée, *Notes sur les Origines de l'Organisation Municipale en Bretagne* (Annales de Bretagne, XXXV. 3).

ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

General reviews: G. Bourgin, *Histoire d'Italie: Période du Risorgimento, 1919–1921*, I. (Revue Historique, September); K. Schellhaus, *Bericht über die Historische Literatur Italiens von 1910–21* (Neues Archiv der Gesellschaft für Aeltere Deutsche Geschichtskunde, XLIV.).

The institute for the history of the University of Bologna has brought out the seventh volume in the collection of documents for the history of the university up to the fifteenth century, entitled *Chartularium Studii Bononiensis* (Imola, Galeati, 1923, pp. 365).

P. Mardone has brought out a work on *Genova e Pisa nei loro Rapporti Commerciali col Mezzogiorno d'Italia fra la Fine del Secolo XII. et gl'Inizi del XIII.* (Prato, La Tipografica, 1923, pp. xviii, 123).

A new volume in the *Corpus Statutorum Italicorum* is *Statuti Rurali Bresciani del Sec. XIV.* (Milan, Bestetti and Tumminelli, 1923, pp. 288), edited by B. Nogara, R. Cessi, and G. Bonelli.

V. Pacifici's work on *Ippolito II. d'Este Cardinale di Ferrara* (Tivoli, Soc. di Storia e d'Arte in Villa d'Este, 1923, pp. xvi, 471) is drawn from original unpublished documents.

A. Ferrari's study of *La Preparazione Intellettuale del Risorgimento Italiano* (Milan, Treves, 1923, pp. 283) covers the period from 1748 to 1789.

L'Italia nella Albania Meridionale, a documented work by A. C. Colonna di Cesaro, covering the years 1917 and 1918, has been recently brought out by the Anonima Libreria Italiana, Milan.

No. 70–72 of the *Boletín del Centro de Estudios Americanistas de Sevilla* continues Fray Pedro N. Pérez's account of the Mercedarians who came to Spanish America, and Señor J. P. Rubio's account of the *piloto mayor* of the Casa de la Contratación, the latter continuation consisting of illustrative documents.

The prize of the Academy of History has been awarded to D. J. Sanchis y Sivera for his work, *Nomenclator Geográfico Eclesiástico de los Pueblos de la Diócesis de Valencia* (Valencia, 1922, pp. 477), which gives an historical and geographical account of all the villages of the diocese, drawn from the archives of the crown of Aragon and local archives.

The relations between Spain and the chief countries of Europe and America during the years 1873–1923 are described in *L'Espagne dans la Politique Mondiale* (Paris, Bossard, 1923, pp. 352), by Albert Mousset.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Jordan, *La Politique Ecclésiastique de Roger I. et les Origines de la "Légation Sicilienne"* (Le Moyen Age, September, January); P. Santini, *Le Più Antiche Riforme superstiti dei Costituti Fiorentini del Comune e del Popolo* (Archivio Storico Italiano, anno LXXIX., vol. II.); M. Peyre, *Marbeuf et l'Organisation Économique de la Corse à la Veille de la Révolution* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, November); A. Pingaud, *Le Premier Royaume d'Italie: le Développement du Système Napoléonien*, III. (*ibid.*, September); P. Orsi, *Dispacci, Lettere e Proclami di Giorni assai agitati nella Storia Toscana, 30 Gennaio–20 Febbraio 1849* (Nuova Antologia, October 1); G. Cirot, *Recherches sur la Chronique Latine des Rois de Castille*, IV. *Quelques Manuscrits de l'Escorial* (Bulletin Hispanique, April–June).

GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

General review: G. Allemang, *Courrier Allemand* [books in German, 1920–1922, on German and Austrian history], I. (Revue des Questions Historiques, October).

A detailed and thoughtful study of economic relations in the kingdom of Germany from 900 to 1250 by B. Heusinger, *Das Servitium Regis in der Deutschen Kaiserzeit*, which appeared in the *Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, Band VIII., Hefte 1, 2 (1922), is separately published by the Vereinigung Wissenschaftlicher Verleger, Berlin (pp. 133).

The fourth volume of the publications of the Verein für Hamburger Geschichte is a study by R. Hertz, of *Das Hamburger Seehandelhaus J. C. Godeffroy und Sohn, 1766–1879* (Hamburg, Hartung, 1922), a house which played an important part in the maritime and colonial activities of Germany.

While in Berlin last summer, Professor Robert H. Lord of Harvard University obtained copies in the Berlin archives of important documents of July, 1870, dealing with the question of the Hohenzollern candidature and other matters on the eve of the declaration of war. Professor Lord has arranged to publish these documents with a suitable introduction, through the Harvard University Press. It is hoped that the volume will appear early in 1924.

William II. of Germany and Prince Bismarck play the chief rôles in the book entitled *Aus 50 Jahren: Erinnerungen, Tagebücher, und Briefe aus dem Nachlass des Fürsten Philipp zu Eulenburg-Hertefeld* (Berlin, Paetel Brothers, 1923, pp. xv, 299).

Maximilian von Hagen's account of *Bismarcks Kolonialpolitik* (Stuttgart and Gotha, F. A. Perthes, 1923, pp. xxvi, 593) is said to be a work of sound and comprehensive scholarship.

There is a great demand for books on Bismarck. Freiherr von Eppstein's work, *Fürst Bismarcks Entlassung* (Berlin, Aug. Scherl, 1923, pp. 269), based on notes made by the minister of state, Dr. von Boetticher, and the head of the imperial chancery, Dr. von Rottenburg, has reached a third edition. *Bismarcks Staatsrecht: die Stellungnahme des Fürsten Otto von Bismarck zu den wichtigsten Fragen des Deutschen und Preussischen Staatsrechts* (Berlin, Hafen-Verlag, 1923, pp. 593) has appeared in a new and revised edition prepared by Freiherr von Eppstein and Conrad Bornhak. The views of Bismarck with regard to many topics being quoted from his speeches, etc., the volume has its use as a collection of sources.

The second part of *Organisationen der Kriegführung* (Berlin, Vereinigung Wissenschaftlicher Verleger, 1923, pp. xiv, 603) bears the subtitle *Die Organisationen für die Versorgung des Heeres*.

Gaston Raphaël has brought out *Le Roi de la Ruhr, Hugo Stinnes: l'Homme, son Oeuvre, son Rôle* (Paris, Payot, 1923, pp. 224).

The history of the relations that have existed between church and state in Austria is set forth in Dr. S. Guggenberger's volume, *Kirche und Staat in Oesterreich* (Vienna, 1923).

The fourth volume of the *Inventare Oesterreichischer Staatlicher Archive*, dealing with the Styrian state archives in Graz, was published at Vienna in 1923.

A brief but very useful and authoritative treatment of an important subject is Professor A. F. Pribram's *Austrian Foreign Policy, 1908–1918* (London, Allen and Unwin, pp. 128).

E. Bonjour's study of *Die Bauernbewegung des Jahres 1525 im Staate Bern* is published by Haupt (Bern, 1923).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Kehr, *Bericht über die Herausgabe der Monumenta Germaniae Historica 1921* (Neues Archiv, XLV.

1); W. Stach, *Jagd und Jagdhunde in den Volksrechten* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXI. 3); Elisabeth Bamberger, *Die Finanzverwaltung in den Deutschen Territorien des Mittelalters, 1200–1500* (Zeitschrift für die Gesamte Staatswissenschaft, LXXVII. 1, 2); Ermentrude von Ranke, *Die Wirtschaftlichen Beziehungen Kölns zu Frankfurt a. M., Süddeutschland, und Italien im 16. und 17. Jahrhundert, 1500–1650* (Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XVII. 1, 2); G. Labouchère, *Guillaume Ancel, Envoyé Résident en Allemagne, 1576–1613, d'après sa Correspondance* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, XXXVII. 2); E. Baasch, *Hamburg und Bremen und die Deutschen Wirtschaftlichen Einheitsbestrebungen von der Begründung des Zollvereins bis zum Anschluss Hannovers, 1845* (Hansische Geschichtsblätter, XXVII.); H. Rogge, *Bismarcks Kolonialpolitik als Aussenpolitisches Problem* (Historische Vierteljahrschrift, XXI. 3); Fr. Engel-Janosi, *Ueber die Entwicklung der Sozialen und Staatswirtschaftlichen Verhältnisse im Deutschen Oesterreich, 1815–1848* (Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XVII. 1, 2); H. Steinacker, *Oesterreich-Ungarn und Osteuropa* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXXVIII. 3).

NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

General review: N. Japikse, *Nederlandsche Historische Literatuur* (Bijdragen voor Vaterlandsche Geschiedenis en Oudheidkunde, fifth ser., X. 1–2).

In the last week of June or the first week in July a series of lectures, in English, on Dutch history will be given at Leyden, chiefly for English and American auditors, under the auspices of the Nederlandsch Amerikaansche Fundatie. Among the lecturers will be Professors Colenbrander, Eekhof, and van Vollenhoven.

Robert Fruin's celebrated book on the constitutional history of the Dutch Republic, *Geschiedenis der Staatsinstellingen in Nederland* (1901), having gone out of print, a new edition, prepared by Professor H. T. Colenbrander, has been published by Nijhoff.

Under the title *Slingelandt's Efforts towards European Peace* (the Hague, Nijhoff), Dr. A. Goslinga, a Dutch scholar, but writing in English, discusses the whole range of Dutch foreign policy from 1713 to 1736, and much of European diplomatic history in that period, in connection with the personality of the Dutch statesman Simon van Slingelandt.

All the treaties and accords to which the Netherlands has been a party since the beginning of the present century have been brought together by C. J. E. Bosmans and M. Visser, functionaries of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, in a *Répertoire des Traités et des Engagements Internationaux du XX^e Siècle concernant les Pays-Bas* (the Hague, Nijhoff, pp. 155).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Eugène Hubert, *Les Princes-Évêques de Liège et les Édits de Joseph II. en Matière Ecclésiastique* (Bulletin de la Commission Royale d'Histoire, LXXXVII. 2); R. Häpke, *Die Wirtschaftspolitik im Königreich der Niederlande, 1815–1830* (Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XVII. 1, 2).

NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

General review: *Histoire de Danemark: Publications récentes concernant le Slesvig Recouvré* (Revue Historique, September); the *Bulletin Bibliographique* of *Le Moyen Age* for January–April lists 239 writings dealing with the medieval history of Poland and published from 1911 to 1921.

A review by Dr. Kristian Erslev of the work accomplished in the field of Danish history from about 1864 to 1911 was published on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, by his former pupils at the University of Copenhagen, under the title *Vort Slægtleds Arbejde i Dansk Historie* (Copenhagen, Gyldendal, 1922).

The Yale University Press has published a translation from the Russian, by Mr. J. D. Duff, of parts I. and II. of the *Memoirs of Alexander Herzen*, important sources for the history of Russia in the nineteenth century and of socialism.

Sir George William Buchanan, British minister to Russia at the outbreak of the Great War, has given his memoirs to the world in two volumes bearing the title *My Mission to Russia and other Diplomatic Memories* (Boston, Little).

The causes and effects of the Russian Revolution are treated by Grégoire Alexinsky in *Du Tsarisme au Communisme* (Paris, Colin, 1923, pp. 288).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Haff, *Bauerliches Gewohnheitsrecht in Norwegen* (Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XVII. 1, 2); J.-W. Bienstock, *Le Journal Intime de Nicolas II.* (Mercure de France, November 1); B. Maklakoff, *Pourishkévitch et l'Évolution des Partis en Russie* (Revue de Paris, October 15); Princesse Olga Poutiatine, *Les Derniers Jours du Grand-Duc Michel*, I., II. (Revue des Deux Mondes, November 1, 15); Amy Hewes, *Trade Union Development in Soviet Russia* (American Economic Review, December); P. Olberg, *Sowjetrusslands Politik im Orient* (Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik, L. 1).

SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

The Ungarische Institut of the University of Berlin has put forth an exceedingly useful bibliography of books in other languages than Magyar on the history of Hungary, *Bibliographia Hungariae*, I. *Historica* (Berlin, de Gruyter, pp. xi, 318), prepared by Professor Robert Gragger, and

embracing, in systematic order, some 9000 titles of independent publications of the period 1861–1921 relating to all parts of Hungarian history, to 1921.

Gustave Schlumberger has written a valuable biography of Nicephorus Phocas under the title *Un Empereur Byzantin au Dixième Siècle* (Paris, Boccard, 1923, pp. v, 648).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Comte Étienne Zichy, *L'Origine du Peuple Hongrois*, I. (Revue des Études Hongroises et Finno-Ougriennes, January–June); N. Bănescu, *Les Premiers Témoignages Byzantins sur les Roumains du Bas-Danube* (Byzantinisch-Neugriechische Jahrbücher, III. 3–4); Pierre de Quirielle, *Le Président Masaryk* (Revue des Deux Mondes, October 15).

ASIA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

Gotama Buddha, a Biography, by Kenneth J. Saunders, based on the canonical books of the Theravadin (Oxford University Press, pp. 112), will meet the needs of those who wish in brief compass a statement of the present knowledge of scholars concerning this momentous life.

The Indian Branch of the Oxford University Press has published the *Commentary of Father Monserrate, S. J.*, on his journey to the court of Akbar, where he arrived early in 1580, on the first Jesuit mission to that court, and remained for two years as tutor to one of the emperor's sons. The manuscript, finished in 1590, was discovered in the library of St. Paul's Cathedral, Calcutta, in 1906, and is now translated from the original Latin by J. T. Hoyland and annotated by S. N. Banerjee (pp. xxii, 220, xlviii).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Pottier, *Carchémish* (Journal des Savants, May–June); Col. G. P. Ranken, *The Punjab under Native Rule* (Edinburgh Review, October); M. Dutreb, *L'Amiral Dupré et la Conquête du Tonkin* (Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises, XVI. 3); A. H. Rowbotham, *A Brief Account of the Early Development of Sinology* (Chinese Social and Political Science Review, April); H. S. Quigley, *The Political System of Imperial China* (American Political Science Review, November).

AFRICA, MEDIEVAL AND MODERN

The firm of Longmans has brought out *Social and Diplomatic Memories (second series), 1894–1901: Egypt and Abyssinia*, by Sir James Rennell Rodd.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: F. Charles-Roux, *L'Inde Britannique et l'Expédition de Bonaparte en Égypte* (Revue des Questions Historiques, October).

AMERICA

GENERAL ITEMS

The Carnegie Institution of Washington publishes this month the first volume, running to 1689, of Dr. Leo F. Stock's edition of the *Proceedings and Debates of the British Parliaments respecting North America*, a volume of some 500 pages.

Among recent accessions of the Division of Manuscripts in the Library of Congress are: Timothy Pickering's book of accounts, as secretary of state, with the Bank of the United States, 1796–1799; about eighty letters to Peachey P. Gilmer from Dabney Carr and William Wirt, 1801–1836; a quarto volume of letters from James J. Wilson and Hezekiah Niles to William Darlington, 1804–1834; a letter-book of Captain Raphael Semmes, U.S.N., 1848–1858; and General Jubal A. Early's manuscript account of his advance on Washington in July, 1864.

Those interested in the prevalent assaults of ardent but misguided patriots on good historical text-books will like to know that an elaborate report on Professor Muzzey's *American History*, by a special committee of the Board of Education of Washington, D. C., has been printed in a pamphlet of 39 pages and is obtainable from the board.

Professor Archer B. Hulbert has brought out through the firm of Doubleday, Page, and Company *The Making of the American Republic*, in which the relation of the economic and social to the political factors is emphasized.

Leaders in Making America: an Elementary History of the United States, by Wilbur F. Gordy, is from the press of Scribner.

Recent numbers of the *Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science* are: *The Shop Committee in the United States*, by Dr. Carroll E. French; and *Bavaria and the Reich: the Conflict over the Law for the Protection of the Republic*, by Dr. Johannes Mattern.

Among the contents of the June number of the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* are an article on the Right Rev. Edward W. Barron, D.D., 1801–1854, by Ella M. E. Flick, and one on the Work of the Sisters of Mercy in the Archdiocese of San Francisco, 1854–1921, by Sister Mary Eulalia Herron.

The chapters relating to agriculture in Professor E. L. Bogart's work, *Economic History of the United States*, have been combined and issued under the title *Economic History of American Agriculture* (Longmans). The volume is intended as a text-book for agricultural colleges.

A History of the American Drama from the Beginning to the Civil War, by Arthur H. Quinn, is not without its interest for historically minded persons (Harper).

Popular Names of Federal Statutes (Washington, Government Printing Office, Library Branch) is a useful list based on the records of the American Law Section, Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, and compiled under the direction of Dr. Henry J. Harris, chief of the Division of Documents in that library.

ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

The National Society of the Colonial Dames of America has just published, through the Macmillan Company, and in continuance of its documentary historical publications for the period preceding the Revolution, a volume entitled *Privateering and Piracy in the Colonial Period: Illustrative Documents*, edited by J. F. Jameson.

The Pictorial Life of Benjamin Franklin (a book of pictures with accompanying text) has been published in commemoration of the 200th anniversary of the arrival of Franklin in Philadelphia (Philadelphia, Dill and Collins).

Last September, on occasion of the unveiling of the tablet placed on the birthplace of Israel Putnam, an address on his life was given by Major George Haven Putnam; it is to be found printed in a pamphlet, *The Putnam Association of America: Report of Meeting, September 14, 1923* (New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons).

The causes and nature of our Revolution are further discussed in a recent volume by a high authority: *The American Revolution, a Constitutional Interpretation* (Macmillan), by Professor Charles H. McIlwain of Harvard University.

The Government Printing Office, after a regrettable interval of some years, has brought out two more volumes (XXIV. and XXV., pp. 528, 529–1050) of the *Journals of the Continental Congress*, edited from the original records in the Library of Congress by Dr. Gaillard Hunt, and presenting the transactions of the year 1783.

The Army of the American Revolution and its Organizer, by Rudolph Cronau, is published in New York by the author (340 East 198th Street).

The Macmillan Company has brought out *The Constitution of the United States: an Historical Survey of its Formation*, by Professor Robert L. Schuyler of Columbia University.

Houghton Mifflin Company has brought out, in a two-volume edition limited to 525 copies, Thomas Anburey's *Travels through the Interior Parts of America*, first published in 1789.

A *Life of Thomas Coke*, by Warren A. Candler, is one of the series *Methodist Founders* (Nashville, Cokesbury Press).

Volney et l'Amérique (1923, pp. 208) has been brought out by Professor Gilbert Chinard as vol. I. of the *Johns Hopkins University Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages*. It is based on unpublished documents, including Volney's correspondence with Jefferson.

One Hundred Years of the Monroe Doctrine, by Robert G. Cleland, has been brought out in Los Angeles by the *Times-Mirror* Press. A volume of the same title, by Professor David Y. Thomas of the University of Arkansas, has been published by the Macmillan Company.

Charles Scribner's Sons have included in their *Modern Student's Library* the *Autobiography of David Crockett*, with an introduction by Hamlin Garland. The volume includes reprints of *A Narrative of the Life of David Crockett of the State of Tennessee* (1834), *Col. Crockett's Tour to the North and Down East* (1835), omitting most of the political speeches, and *Col. Crockett's Exploits and Adventures in Texas* (1836), omitting the preface signed by Alexandre Dumas and the final chapter recounting Crockett's last hours. The last-mentioned work, although autobiographical in form, is regarded as spurious, but is included because it is an important part of the record of Crockett's life and is "in character". This little volume therefore includes essentially all of the Crockett books except the *Sketches and Eccentricities of Col. David Crockett of West Tennessee* (1833), which was not authorized by Crockett. One considerable extract from this work, a description of a visit by the anonymous author to the home of Colonel Crockett, is, however, included in the introduction.

The Yale University Press has brought out *The Correspondence of James Fenimore Cooper* in two volumes, edited by his grandson, James Fenimore Cooper. The letters (1800–1851), together with some reminiscences by Cooper's daughter, Susan Augusta Fenimore Cooper, throw a flood of light on the life and thought of the times, touch intimately many of the prominent characters of the day, and reveal Cooper's own interesting personality.

The address of Professor Arthur C. Cole, *Lincoln's "House Divided" Speech: Did it Reflect a Doctrine of Class Struggle?* delivered before the Chicago Historical Society Mar. 15, 1923, has been published by the University of Chicago Press.

Mr. Roy B. Cook announces a volume of about a hundred pages on *The Family and Early Life of Stonewall Jackson* (Richmond, Old Dominion Press).

The Bureau of Pensions: its History, Activities, and Organization, by Gustavus W. Weber, is no. 24 of the *Service Monographs of the United States Government* brought out by the Institute for Government Research (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press).

Fifty Years on the Old Frontier as Cowboy, Hunter, Guide, Scout, and Ranchman, by James H. Cook, with an introduction by Brig.-Gen. Charles King, is from the Yale University Press.

Professor Robert M. McElroy's *Grover Cleveland, the Man and Statesman: an Authorized Biography*, in two volumes, has come from the press (Harper).

Lord Charnwood's *Theodore Roosevelt* is now out (Boston, *Atlantic Monthly* Press).

Cycles of Unemployment in the United States, 1903–1922 (Boston, Houghton Mifflin, pp. xiii, 88), by William A. Berridge, is a monograph which won the first prize of $1000 offered by the Pollak Foundation for Economic Research in 1921, and is now put forth as one of the publications of that institution.

The two volumes of *Treaties, Conventions, etc., between the United States and other Powers, 1776–1909*, issued by the Government Printing Office in 1910, were continued by another Senate document of 1913 constituting a third volume. This supplement has now been superseded by a vol. III. (67 Cong., 4 sess., *Sen. Doc.* 348, pp. xxii, 2493–3918), covering the treaties, conventions, etc., of the years 1910–1923.

The Navy Department (Naval Intelligence Office) has published a volume entitled *American Naval Planning Section, London* (pp. v, 537, and 9 maps), reproducing the formal records of that section in London during the Great War. It is the seventh of the publications of the Historical Section.

A *History of the 79th Division, A. E. F., during the World War, 1917–1919*, compiled and edited by the History Commission of the 79th Division Association, is brought out in Lancaster, Pennsylvania, by Steinman.

Woodrow Wilson's Case for the League of Nations, compiled with his approval by Hamilton Foley, has been published by the Princeton University Press. The book includes the League Covenant, but is otherwise entirely a compilation of President Wilson's explanations of the covenant as set forth to the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, in addresses, etc.

Doubleday, Page, and Company have brought out *Robert Bacon, Life and Letters*, by Dr. James Brown Scott, with an introduction by Elihu Root, and a foreword by Field-Marshal Earl Haig.

The Naval War College has published the record of the Conference on the Limitation of Armament, held in Washington, November, 1921, to February, 1922. The volume bears the title *International Law Documents: Conference on the Limitation of Armament, with Notes and Index, 1921* (Washington, Government Printing Office).

LOCAL ITEMS ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

NEW ENGLAND

The Pirates of the New England Coast, 1630–1730, by George F. Dow and John H. Edmonds, with an introduction by Capt. Ernest H. Pentecost, has been brought out in Salem by the Marine Research Society.

A full study of the attempt toward unification of New England under Dudley and Andros is presented in *The Dominion of New England: a Study in British Colonial Policy* (Yale University Press), by Miss Viola F. Barnes, assistant professor of history in Mt. Holyoke College.

The state historian of Maine, Dr. Henry S. Burrage, has recently published for the state a volume of 178 pages entitled *Gorges and the Grant of the Province of Maine in 1622*. It opens with the tercentenary paper prepared by the author in 1922 for the Maine Historical Society, and is followed by the prominent original documents concerning the beginnings of colonial Maine, such as the discoveries and experiences of the early voyagers; the efforts toward colonization; Sir Ferdinando Gorges's *Brief Relation* printed in 1622; and the text of the 1622 grant.

Glimpses of an Old Social Capital (Portsmouth, New Hampshire), as Illustrated by the Life of the Reverend Arthur Browne and his Circle, by Mary C. Rogers, has been brought out in Boston by the author (Copley Square Hotel).

The Massachusetts Historical Society has just published vol. LVI. of its *Proceedings*, October, 1922–June, 1923 (pp. xvii, 513) and *T. Jefferson Coolidge, 1831–1920, an Autobiography* (pp. 311).

The October number of the *Essex Institute Historical Collections* contains a first paper, by William D. Chapple, on Salem and the War of 1812, and the concluding installment of Francis B. C. Bradlee's study of the Suppression of Piracy in the West Indies, besides other continuations hitherto mentioned.

Houghton Mifflin Company has brought out *The Early History of Smith College, 1871–1910*, by Dr. L. Clark Seelye, for many years president of the college.

Two Portuguese Communities in New England, by Donald R. Taft, is a recent number of the *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics, and Public Law*.

The *Catalogue* of the John Carter Brown Library is advanced by the publication of vol. II., pt. 2 (pp. 251–522), finishing that volume and ending with the year 1658.

Dr. Harry L. Barnes, Wallum Lake, R. I., is author and publisher of *The Wallum Pond Estates* (pp. 102, with illustrations), a history of the lands about that lake, in the extreme northwestern corner of Rhode Island, from the earliest records down to recent times, including Indians, early Massachusetts and Rhode Island proprietors, mill development, etc.

MIDDLE COLONIES AND STATES

The Division of Archives and History of the University of the State of New York has brought out as *Bulletin 2* of the *War of the Rebellion* series *Selections from the Letters and Diaries of Brevet Brigadier General*

Willoughby Babcock of the Seventy-Fifth New York Volunteers: a Study of Camp Life in the Union Armies during the Civil War, by Willoughby M. Babcock, jr. The second half of the title is indicative of the character of the work, for while the letters are quoted extensively, the materials have been grouped in such studies as "Camps and Fortifications", "Commissary", "Camp Life", "Transportation", "Organization", "Recreation and Mail", etc.

The April number of the *Quarterly Journal of the New York State Historical Association* contains an article by Francis J. Higginson on Naval Operations during the Revolutionary War, and one by John A. Krout on the Genesis and Development of the Early Temperance Movement in New York State. In the July number is a paper by G. D. B. Hasbrouck entitled History from Lake Mohonk, and one by A. S. Perham on Major-Gen. Gouverneur K. Warren in the Battle of Five Forks.

Nelson Greene of Fort Plain, N. Y., is author and publisher of *The Old Mohawk Turnpike Book* (pp. 340, with 160 illustrations), an historical and present-day description of the section of the Mohawk Valley from Schenectady to Rome.

The principal articles in the October number of the *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society* are: Staten Island: its Consolidation with New York, by James C. Connelly; Revolutionary Days in Old Somerset, by Cornelius C. Vermeule; and Pioneer Days in Boonton, New Jersey, by Miss Cora C. Hammond. The Condict Revolutionary Record Abstracts are continued; and a Young Man's Journal of 1800–1813 is concluded.

The October number of the *Vineland Historical Magazine* continues the European Journal (1874) of Charles K. Landis, and also the Civil War Journal of Dr. Henry W. Cansdell.

The principal articles in the October number of the *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* are: the Real Declaration of Independence, a Study of Colonial History under a Modern Theory, by Henry Leffman; a biographical notice of the Duc de Lauzun, commander of "Lauzun's Legion" in the Revolutionary War, compiled by the late Cornelius Stevenson; Lotteries in Pennsylvania prior to 1833, by Asa E. Martin; and the Provincial and Revolutionary History of St. Peter's Church, Philadelphia, I.–VI., by C. P. B. Jefferys.

The *Bulletin of Friends' Historical Society of Philadelphia*, autumn number, 1923, is chiefly marked by Some Account of the Settlements at the Falls, and the Establishing of the Falls Monthly Meeting, by Henry T. Moon of Fallsington. There are also documents respecting Quakerism on Prince Edward Island in 1774.

The principal articles in the October number of the *Western Pennsylvania Historical Magazine* are: the First Convention of the American Federation of Labor, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, November 15–18, 1881,

by Alfred P. James, and Ethnic Elements of Colonial Pennsylvania and the Population of To-day, by A. F. Southwick.

SOUTHERN COLONIES AND STATES

The contents of vol. XLII. of the *Archives of Maryland* are devoted to the Proceedings and Acts of the General Assembly, 1740–1744. In addition to the usual matters of local concern these proceedings give a mass of details concerning the expedition to the West Indies and the controversies with Governors Ogle and Bladen. The acts passed during these sessions are printed in full, and in the appendix are given extracts from the Calvert Papers and other manuscripts from the Maryland archives, bearing upon the history of this period.

The September number of the *Maryland Historical Magazine* contains, besides continuations, Extracts (1716–1760) from Account and Letter Books of Dr. Charles Carroll, father of Charles Carroll, Barrister, and Notes, by Daniel R. Randall, on a Colonial Free School in Anne Arundel County, with Side Lights upon the Early Education of Johns Hopkins.

Vol. XXV. of the *Records of the Columbia Historical Society* contains a paper by John C. Proctor on Joseph Lancaster and the Lancasterian Schools in the District of Columbia, one by Dr. Charles O. Paullin on Early Movements for a National Observatory, and biographical sketches of three mayors of Washington, Daniel Rapine, John T. Towers, and William A. Bradley.

The *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* brings to a conclusion in the October number the series of Minutes of the Council and General Court, 1622–1632, as also that of Virginia Quit Rent Rolls, 1704, and continues the Kennon Letters (1809), and other series. In the genealogical section is found an Inventory of the Estate of Nathaniel Harrison, Esquire, 1728, occupying twenty pages of the magazine.

The October number of the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* contains a description of the main building of the college before the fire of 1859, by R. J. Morrison; a report by the president, Benjamin S. Ewell, July 5, 1865, respecting the general and financial condition of the college during the war period; a segment of Pleasants Murphy's Journal and Day Book, relating chiefly to Williamsburg (Dec. 17, 1814, to Jan. 11, 1815); the will of William Byrd I., and some documents pertaining to the tobacco trade in Russia, 1705. The register of students in William and Mary College, 1827–1881, is continued.

In the October number of *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* Robert M. Hughes discusses the subject of Floyd's Resignation from Buchanan's Cabinet, presenting considerable documentary evidence. The Journal of a Confederate Soldier (Samuel E. Mays) is continued.

A History of Colonial Virginia: the first Permanent Colony in America, by William B. Cridlin, has appeared in Richmond, from the press of Miller and Rhoads.

The house of Lippincott has brought out *Richmond, its People and its Story*, an attractive and interesting volume by Mrs. W. G. Stanard.

The *Proceedings* of the twenty-second annual session of the State Literary and Historical Association of North Carolina (*Publications* of the North Carolina Historical Commission, Bulletin no. 30) includes the following papers: the American Revolution and Reform in the South, by Professor W. K. Boyd; When the Tide began to turn for Popular Education in North Carolina, 1890–1900, by John E. White; Two Wake County Editors whose Work has influenced the World, by Mrs. J. R. Chamberlain; and Missions of the Moravians of North Carolina among the Southern Indian Tribes, by Edmund Schwarze.

The *University of North Carolina Extension Bulletin*, vol. II., no. 13 (May 1, 1923), is a monograph on *Agricultural Graphics: North Carolina and the United States, 1866–1922*, by Henrietta R. Smedes.

The *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* prints in the October number the original rules of the Charlestown Library Society, organized in 1748, together with the list of members in 1750. The St. Helena's Parish Register is concluded in this number, while the Marriage and Death Notices from the *City Gazette* (November, 1796–January, 1797) and the Abstracts of Records of the Proceedings in the Court of Ordinary, 1764–1771, are continued.

William W. Boddie is the author of a *History of Williamsburg*, that is, the district now known as Williamsburg County, in South Carolina, and the State Company of Columbia is the publisher.

In the March number of the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* is found an account, by L. L. Mackall, of Edward Langworthy and the first attempt to write a separate history of Georgia, with selections from some recently discovered Langworthy papers. The latter are principally letters from General James Jackson to Langworthy (1790, 1795) respecting the proposed history. The same number of the *Quarterly* contains the first part of a study of the Atlanta Campaign, by Lt. Thomas R. Hay, and an article by J. G. Johnson on the Yamassee Revolt of 1597 and the Destruction of the Georgia Missions. The June number contains the second and concluding part of Lt. Hay's paper, an article by W. W. Gordon on Georgia's Debt to Monmouth County, New Jersey, one by Dr. F. K. Boland on Crawford W. Long and the Discovery of Anesthesia, and one by Hon. S. B. Adams on the Yazoo Fraud. To the September number Hon. Warren Grice contributes a paper on Georgia Appointments by President Washington, including about twenty letters from prominent Georgians of the time; Lt. Thomas R. Hay a study of the Campaign and Battle of Chickamauga; and Mary Ross a paper on French Intrusions and

Indian Uprisings in Georgia and South Carolina, 1577–1580, based on manuscript materials in the Archivo General de Indias.

WESTERN STATES

Articles in the September number of the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* are: an account of the sixteenth annual meeting of the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, by Professor Benjamin F. Shambaugh; James Dickson: a Filibuster in Minnesota in 1836, with documents, by Grace Lee Nute; Notes on the Colonization of Texas, by Professor Eugene C. Barker (the same paper appears in the October number of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*); Trans-Mississippi Railroads during the Fifties, by Robert E. Riegel.

The Arthur H. Clark Company has published *The Outlaws of Cave-in-Rock*, by Otto A. Rothert, secretary of the Filson Club. The volume embodies "Historical Accounts of the Famous Highwaymen and River Pirates who operated in Pioneer Days upon the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers and over the old Natchez Trace", which are said to have been carefully verified from contemporary records, court papers, the evidence produced at trials, private archives, and other contemporary sources.

The pages of the April–September issue (double number) of the *Quarterly Publication of the Historical and Philosophical Society of Ohio* are occupied with Dr. Daniel Drake's Memoir of the Miami Country, 1779–1794, edited by Beverley W. Bond, jr. The Memoir was prepared by Dr. Drake as an address on the occasion of the semi-centennial celebration (1838) of the first permanent settlement on the site of Cincinnati; selections from the materials used in its preparation accompany the Memoir.

The *Transactions* of the Western Reserve Historical Society records among a variety of valuable accessions during the year the papers of General Franz Sigel. These include Sigel's private letter-book for 1861, diaries of 1863–1864, despatches and orders from Generals Banks, Burnside, Pope, McClellan, and others, and a large body of miscellaneous papers.

Vol. III. of the *Indiana World War Records*, which the Indiana Historical Commission is bringing out, is *A Sergeant's Diary in the World War: the Diary of an Enlisted Member of the 150th Field Artillery, 1917–1919*, the author being Elmer F. Straub. A *Life of George W. Julian*, by his daughter, Mrs. Grace Julian Clarke, edited and published by the commission, has just been issued as the first volume of an Indiana biographical series. The commission also began in November the monthly issue of the *Indiana History Bulletin*, reporting conferences, the doings of the commission, and other historical news of the state.

The principal articles in the September number of the *Indiana Magazine of History* are a History of an Unusual Library (La Porte, Indi-

ana), by Ella Lonn; a biographical sketch, by J. W. Whicker, of Dr. John Evans (died 1897), instrumental in the establishment of Northwestern University and the University of Denver, promoter of railroads, and philanthropist; and the concluding installment of Adam Leonard's study of Personal Politics in Indiana, 1816–1840.

Among the contents of the April–July (1922) issue of the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* are: Promotion of Historical Study in America following the Civil War, by Professor James A. Woodburn; an account, by Leander Stillwell, of his experiences at the battle of Shiloh; Springfield Society before the Civil War, by Caroline O. Brown; a letter of William Dobell, 1842, describing the Illinois country; two letters of A. S. French, April and June, 1863, from Louisiana and Mississippi, respectively; and a circular letter of Governor Ninian Edwards, 1818.

Chicago's Highways, Old and New: from Indian Trail to Motor Road, by M. M. Quaife, with an introduction by Joy Morton, has been brought out in Chicago by Keller.

The September number of the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* is wholly occupied with the continuation of the Certificate Book of the Virginia Land Commission, 1779–1780. It is announced that the concluding part of the Certificate Book will be issued in a supplement to the September number.

The Big Sandy Valley: a Regional History prior to the Year 1850 (Louisville, Morton), by Willard R. Jillson, Sc.D., is a study of the exploration, settlement, and early development of an important section of eastern Kentucky. There are chapters upon the Wilderness (geological history, the Indians), First Explorations (1674–1775), Border Warfare (1750–1795), the Log Cabin Struggle (1772–1820), Religious Development, and Social and Economic Expansion (1800–1850). There is also an appendix of documents.

It is announced that the S. J. Clarke Publishing Company of Chicago will shortly bring out *Tennessee: the Volunteer State, 1769–1922*, in four volumes, by John Trotwood Moore and A. P. Foster. It is understood that these volumes include much hitherto unused and even unknown material, and that they cover the history of Tennessee from the earliest explorations to the present time, including a discussion of the prehistoric people who inhabited the region.

The January–April issue of the *Michigan History Magazine* includes the address of Mr. W. W. Bishop, a Temple of American History, delivered at the laying of the corner-stone of the William L. Clements Library; Pioneer Days in Eaton County, by Daniel Strange; Medical Reminiscences, by Dr. A. F. Fischer; Reminiscences of William Austin Burt, Inventor of the Solar Compass, by Austin Burt; and Harriet Martineau's Travels in and around Michigan, 1836, reprinted from her

Society in America. The July–October issue contains an article by W. P. F. Ferguson entitled Michigan's Most Ancient Industry, the Prehistoric Mines and Miners of Isle Royale; one by Professor Arthur L. Cross on the question, Is County History Worth While? and one by O. W. Robinson on Travel in Early Days. An account of historical work in Michigan is contributed by the editor.

Recent accessions to the Burton Historical Collection, Detroit Public Library, include a series of letters (83) from N. P. Willis to Brantz Mayer, 1832–1863; five documents relating to the Niagara frontier, 1716–1727, 1814; and correspondence of Eleazer Williams relating to his land grants at Green Bay, Wisconsin (26 items), 1838–1844.

A Dutch Settlement in Michigan, by Aleida J. Pieters, is brought out in Grand Rapids by the Reformed Press.

The State Historical Society of Wisconsin expects to bring out during the present year a *Calendar of Kentucky Papers in the Draper Collection of Manuscripts*, prepared by Miss Mabel C. Weaks. The calendar, which will describe approximately six thousand documents, will follow the style and format of the *Calendar of the Preston and Virginia Papers,* prepared by the same hand. The society plans, as its next venture in the department of Draper Manuscripts, to prepare and publish a calendar of the Tennessee papers in that collection.

In the September number of the *Wisconsin Magazine of History* Dr. Joseph Schafer discourses upon Some Social Traits of Teutons, being the fourth of his studies of the Yankee and the Teuton in Wisconsin; Mrs. W. F. Allen gives an account of the University of Wisconsin soon after the Civil War; Arthur Adams discusses the Historical Society and Genealogical Research; Frances M. Stover relates the story of the *Augusta*, the Schooner that sunk the *Lady Elgin* (September, 1860); James McManus records the Tragedy of Richland City; and William F. Whyte writes of the Beginnings of the Watertown School System. There is also a fragment of autobiography of Jerome A. Watrous (1840–1922), and in the section of Documents are printed some letters of the Rev. John H. Ragatz, a circuit-rider in the Old Northwest.

The contents of the November number of the *Minnesota History Bulletin* include a paper by Theodore Christianson on the Long and Beltrami Explorations in Minnesota; an account of the state historical convention at Redwood Falls in June; and a letter signed "C", written from St. Paul July 22, 1849, and published in the Eaton *Register* Aug. 30, 1849, giving the writer's impressions of Minnesota. Dr. Wayne E. Stevens of Dartmouth College has investigated for the society the manuscript materials for Minnesota history preserved in the various archives and libraries of Montreal.

The State Historical Society of Iowa has published *Literature of Pioneer Life in Iowa*, an address delivered by Frank L. Mott before the

Academy of Science and Letters at Sioux City in March, 1923. Annexed to the address is a partially annotated bibliography extending to 55 pages. To stimulate interest in local history the society has offered a thousand dollars in prizes for essays submitted by high school pupils, the contest to be carried on under the direction of the Iowa Federation of Women's Clubs. The project involves essays of the titles "The Story of My Grandmother", "The Story of My Grandfather", "Old Settlers' Story", and "A Story of My Community".

The January (1923) number of the *Annals of Iowa* contains the Diary of John S. Morgan, Company G, Thirty-third Iowa Infantry; a paper by Hon. Charles Aldrich on Journalism of Northwest Iowa; and one by William H. Fleming, entitled the Second Officer in the Government. Mr. Fleming's paper is chiefly concerned with the question of succession in the history of the vice-presidency, but in part also with the same aspect of the lieutenant-governorship of Iowa.

The October number of the *Palimpsest* contains an account, by Donald L. McMurry, of Kelly's Army (1894), and a sketch, by Dorothy MacBride, of Lieutenant Jefferson Davis. The Scotch Grove Trail, in the November number, is an account, by Bruce E. Mahan, of the Scottish settlement in Jones County, Iowa.

The principal contents of the October number of the *Missouri Historical Review* are: the Missouri Pacific Railroad to 1879, by R. E. Riegel; the Story of the Bald Knobbers, by A. M. Haswell; the third of the articles by Walter B. Stevens on the New Journalism in Missouri; the third installment of the history of the Jayhawkers in Missouri, 1858–1863, by Hildegarde R. Herklotz; and the thirteenth part of William G. Bek's study of the Followers of Duden.

A *History of the Arkansas Press for a Hundred Years and More*, by Frederick W. Allsopp, is published in Little Rock by the Parke-Harper Publishing Company.

Articles in the October number of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly*, other than continuations hitherto mentioned, are: New Mexico and the Texan Sante Fé Expedition, by William C. Binkley; Notes on the Colonization of Texas, by Eugene C. Barker; and the Expedition of Pánfilo de Narváez, from Oviedo, edited by Harbert Davenport. In the section of "Notes and Fragments" is a brief account of the historical materials in the Rosenberg Library at Galveston.

The Nebraska Historical Society has recently received from Major-Gen. W. H. Carter a body of important manuscripts and pictures relating to the earliest history of old Fort Kearny. The society intends to publish a monograph about that fort, as being the most important post on the Oregon Trail between the Missouri and the Laramie rivers.

A History of the Constitutional Convention of the State of Oklahoma, by Albert H. Ellis, has been published in Muskogee by the Economy Printing Company.

The contents of the October number of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* include, besides continuations, an article by Victor J. Farrar on Senator Cole and the Purchase of Alaska; one by Della M. Coon on Klickitat County; and one by Barbara C. Elliott on Cape Disappointment in History. There is also a reprint, from the *Friend* (Honolulu, May, 1923), of an account of Edwin O. Hall's visit to Oregon in 1839.

The September number of the *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* includes a History of High School Legislation in Oregon to 1910, by Charles A. Howard; John Work's Journey from Fort Vancouver to Umpqua River and Return in 1834, with introduction and comments by Leslie M. Scott; and the third installment of the Diary of Rev. George Gary.

CANADA

Sir Leicester Harmsworth has presented to the Public Archives of Canada, as a memorial of his brother the late Viscount Northcliffe, a collection of original documents, to be called the Northcliffe Memorial Collection, consisting chiefly of the papers of Lieut.-Gen. Robert Monckton (1726–1782). These embrace 14 volumes relating to Monckton's service in Nova Scotia, 1752–1758; 2 volumes containing 79 letters from Amherst (1758–1763); 17 volumes relating to the Quebec expedition and Wolfe (1759); 8 volumes connected with the command of the southern province at Philadelphia, to which Monckton was appointed in 1760; 12 volumes relating to his expedition against Martinique (1761–1762); 16 volumes of papers connected with his governorship of New York (1761–1765); 6 order-books of 1742–1745; and 11 volumes of miscellaneous and private papers. The collection also contains many other papers of historical value, including Wolfe's order-book of 1748–1759, and six volumes of original journals kept by Thomas Bell, one of Wolfe's aides-de-camp at Quebec. The Public Archives have also acquired a small collection of documents relating to Nova Scotia during the Protectorate of Oliver Cromwell.

The *Canadian Historical Review* for June contains an anonymous article on the Canadian Militia before the Great War; Some Letters of David Thompson, contributed by Lawrence J. Burpee, president of the Canadian Historical Association; a statement of the Early Choice of the Forty-Ninth Parallel as a Boundary Line, by Charles O. Paullin, of the Department of Historical Research, Carnegie Institution of Washington; some unpublished material respecting Louis Riel and the Fenian Raid of 1871, contributed by A. H. de Trémaudan; an article entitled a Treaty and a Signature, by Sir John Willison, which discusses the issues involved in the halibut fisheries treaty recently concluded at Washington; and a note, contributed by Lieut.-Col. W. S. Buell, on the military career of "Red George" Macdonell. In the September issue James F. Kenney, of the Public Archives, gives an account of the first annual meeting of the Canadian Historical Association; Professor Alexander Brady, of

Wesley College, writes on the New Dominion as affected by the establishment of the Irish Free State; Miss Emmaline E. Smillie makes an Historical Survey of Indian Migration within the Empire; and F. H. Soward, of the University of British Columbia, publishes a letter of John Richardson, a Montreal merchant and member of the North West Company, relating to the first assembly in Lower Canada.

AMERICA, SOUTH OF THE UNITED STATES

The *ayuntamiento* of the city of Mexico has approved for publication the *Historia Precolonial de Mexico* the preparation of which it had entrusted to the municipal archivist, Señor Jesús Galindo y Villa, and to the historian Señor Victoriano Salado Alvarez.

Professor Hermann Beyer of the University of Mexico has published vol. I., and is preparing the second volume, of a general journal of Mexican antiquities, with varied contents of high quality, *Revista Internacional de Arqueología, Etnografía, Folklore (Tradiciones Populares), Prehistoria, Historia Antigua, y Linguística Mexicanas.*

Don Manuel Nicolás Corpancho was envoy of Peru in Mexico from March, 1862, to September, 1863, when, given his passports by the government of the regency because of his sympathetic course toward the party of Juárez, he perished in the burning of his steamer in the Gulf of Mexico. His correspondence during that period with his home government, printed by the Peruvian Foreign Office in 1907, is now reprinted by the Mexican Ministry of Foreign Affairs, *La Misión de Corpancho* (pp. xiii, 237), with an introduction by Señor Genaro Estrada of that ministry.

The University of London Press announcements include a book on *Colonial Agents of the British West Indies,* by Dr. Lillian M. Penson, a study extending from the first appointment of such agents in the middle of the seventeenth century to the dissolution of their office two centuries later.

Piracy in the West Indies and its Suppression, 1820–1832, by Francis B. C. Bradlee, is published in Salem by the Essex Institute.

The *Boletín del Archivo Nacional* (Cuban) for 1922 contains a body of documents respecting the English siege of St. Augustine in 1740; a continuation of the documents respecting the "Gran Legion del Aguila Negra" (1830), and a further installment of the "Epistolario" of the Revolution of 1895. There is also the concluding installment, 1781–1785, of a calendar of *reales órdenes.*

The Peruvian Chamber of Deputies has lately published, in a volume of 383 pages, the texts of all the *Constituciones Políticas del Perú,* from 1821 to 1919.

A contribution of considerable importance to the general literature of Bolivian history is made by Señor Alcides Arguedas in his *Historia General de Bolivia: el Proceso de la Nacionalidad, 1809–1821* (La Paz, 1922, pp. xi, 579).

The Histories of Brazil of Pedro de Magalhães de Gandavo, translated into English and annotated by John B. Stetson, jr., has been published, in two volumes, by the Cortes Society, as no. 5 of the series *Documents and Narratives concerning the Discovery and Conquest of Latin America.* A facsimile of the Portuguese original, 1576, is included.

The most important original work on the Dutch period in Brazil, Caspar Barlaeus's *Rerum in Brasilia Gestarum sub Praefectura Comitis J. Mauritii* (Amsterdam, 1647), is now to be brought out in a Dutch translation by Mr. S. P. L'Honoré Naber, *Nederlandsch Brazilië onder het Bewind van Johan Maurits, Grave van Nassau, 1637–1644* (the Hague, Martinus Nijhoff, pp. 444). The volume will be handsomely printed, in the size of the original, in a limited edition, with reproductions of maps and plates, 67 in number, mostly from the original work, with some others. The original has become quite rare.

Mario de Lima-Barbosa is the author of *Les Français dans l'Histoire du Brésil* (Paris, Blanchard, 1923, pp. 484).

Recent issues in the *Biblioteca Ayacucho* (Madrid, Editorial-América) are *La Evolución Republicana durante la Revolución Argentina,* by Adolfo Saldias, and *La Reconquista Española de Chile en 1814,* by Miguel Luís and Gregorio Victor Amunátegui (Madrid, pp. 451).

In the *Colección de Publicaciones Históricas de la Biblioteca del Congreso Argentino,* Don Roberto Levillier has published, from the manuscript materials in the Archivo General de Indias at Seville, a second volume (1583–1600) of his *Probanzas de Méritos y Servicios de los Conquistadores de Tucumán* (pp. lxix, 624), and a first volume (pp. lxxiv, 350) of the *Correspondencia de Presidente y Oidores de la Audiencia de Lima,* extending from 1549 to 1564.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: M. Besson, *Les Derniers Natchez; Épisode de la Colonisation de la Louisiane en 1730* (Revue de l'Histoire des Colonies Françaises, XVI. 3); Major E. N. McClellan, U. S. M. C., *The Navy at the Battles of Trenton and Princeton* (U. S. Naval Institute Proceedings, November); Major-Gen. W. H. Carter, *A British Dragoon* [Tarleton] *in the American Revolution* (Cavalry Journal, October); Charles Warren, *New Light on the History of the Federal Judiciary Act of 1789* (Harvard Law Review, November); C. E. Hughes, *Observations on the Monroe Doctrine* (American Journal of International Law, October); E. S. Corwin, *The Monroe Doctrine* (North American Review, December); Hon. Benjamin Russell, *What we owe to Francis Parkman* (Dalhousie Review, October); H. F. Gosnell, *Thomas C. Platt, Political*

Manager (Political Science Quarterly, September); P. A. Means, *Some Comments on the Inedited Manuscript of Poma de Ayala* [Peru, *circa* 1613] (American Anthropologist, July–September); J. Boubée, *L'Église et l'État au Pérou* (Études, October 20); C. A. Ugarte, *The Agrarian Policy of Peru: Notes for an Economic History of the Republic* (Inter-America, English, October); Sir W. Allardyce, *The Falkland Islands in History* (Dalhousie Review, October).